

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXCV.]

MARCH, 1861.

[VOL. XVII.

SIR JOHN BOWRING ON THE WEAKENED INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH.

A REMARKABLE letter which the head of the St. Simonians (Father Enfantin) lately addressed to the Bishop Dupanloup, has elicited some thoughts on the enormous power formerly possessed by the Papacy—on the wonderful influences it employed in advancing all that once represented civilization in its various developments—on the decline of that authority—and on the transfer to other agencies of the great machinery of progress and improvement under whose action the world is now so wonderfully advancing.

Time was when the Church represented all that was impulsive, improving, elevating, ennobling. It has wholly lost its ancient heritage. Instead of leading the van of knowledge, science, art, it is now in the rear,—the drag upon, instead of the excitement to, the world's excelsior. How has it fallen from the heights into the abysses of the social hierarchy? It has misdirected its efforts, misunderstood its mission. It reaps as it has sown.

By what has the world been silently but wholly revolutionized? By commerce, by free thought, by roads and railways, by ships and steamers, by electric telegraphs, by every facility which has brought man nearer to man. Has the Church contributed in any way to these grand outpourings of activity and intellect? In no manner whatever. She has looked with a careless, if not an averted, eye on the agitations which have shaken the ancient earth and created a world—nay, many worlds —anew. Ever lagging behind, while man has been moving more and more rapidly forward, the Church and Civilization are every day more and more asundered.

The answer which the Bishop makes to the reproaches of the Father is only, You cannot appreciate, you do not understand our dogmas. But what is the value of these dogmas in the great struggle of mind? There was a day when polemics occupied all human intellect, when no higher object employed the keenest and most subtle of philosophers and schoolmen. Who cares now for the quarrels of the dark ages? They are as little thought of as the heavy snags which the steamers pass by in the

Mississippi. Dogmas, progressive, expansive, would not have lost their power; but the stationary and stereotyped infallibilities of departed time have as little to do with the mighty movements of the mind as have the decaying jargons of the North American Indians with the progress of European literature.

It is indeed averred by some, that the Church has not repudiated the co-operation of science, of commerce, of civilization. But this is little: to have maintained her influence, she should have headed, directed, cherished, fecundated the movement. This was beyond her conception, perhaps beyond her capacity. All that has been done is without and beyond the circle of ecclesiastical authority. Science has condemned, has overthrown the pillars of the Church, and the Church has blindly and negligently allowed her citadels to be invaded, her strongholds to be wrested out of her hands.

The Church was once the great patron and protector of industry. Her children laboured in the fields and taught the people to labour, helping them in their advance towards emancipation. Roads, bridges, protection for travellers, security for property, were under the guardianship of the clergy. Strange the contrast between the "beloved fathers" of the time of the VIIth Gregory and the idle monks of the days of Pius the IXth!

In the dark sepulchral superstitions of the twelfth century the Church has buried the lights of the nineteenth, and from that interment there can be no resurrection. There did indeed dawn an epoch in which a blaze of glory fell from the poets, the painters, the sculptors, the architects of Italy, upon the "Eternal City" and its dependent states. It was the flash of a magnificent but passing storm of lightning and of thunder. The splendours of that age surround the names of the great men who made it so illustrious. The Church appropriated their works, but caught none of their inspiration. Yet it shewed no insensibility to the value of the noble contributions of genius to civilization.

In our era,—the era of popular progress, the era of practical improvement, the era of useful science, of peace, of colonization, of extending trade, of rapid intercourse, of industry, of discussion, of agitation,—it may again be asked, What has the Church done—what is the Church doing? Has it raised itself to the wants of the age? Has it helped the mighty and progressive work? Has it made concessions to, has it sought auxiliaries in, those potent agencies which are revolutionizing and must finally revolutionize the world? Alas, no! For it and for its representatives, the Copernican philosophy is a myth,—Bacon and Newton, deceivers of the people,—astronomical facts, geological discoveries, are heresies and falsehoods. Repugnance and resistance meet every suggestion which would serve the forward, pressing interests of man. Twenty years ago, I recommended Gregory the XVIth to assist in the establishment of railways in

the Pontifical states. I might as well have asked him to throw his tiara into the Tiber!

And while the Church has allowed these noble elements, these really religious and Christian polemics, to escape her control and guidance, has not the spirit of Christianity—of Christ himself—been insensibly entering the hearts, elevating the intellects and directing the pursuits of men, who have perhaps never asked and never known whether or how they were engaged in the service of Truth, which is indeed that of progress in all its developments? And inasmuch as the name of Religion is given to usages and forms and dogmas which have nothing in them of a really religious character, are there not excellences essentially religious which go by other designations, but which bear the true type, the divine impress, of gospel teachings? There is in every man's heart a latent Christ moving and inspiring; it answers to that part of our being which we call divine—the spiritual, the undying.

In no more obvious shape is its presence to be traced than in that sentiment of brotherhood which, in spite of sinister interests and rancour growing out of old traditions, is pervading all nations. Men cannot, do not hate as they once hated. They know one another better and better; they can serve each other more and more. They are engaged in the reception and the diffusion of mutual and reciprocal benefits. Has the Church helped to cement, to sanctify these happy tendencies? She has exhibited no sympathy for them, lent no aid in strengthening or extending them. Many signs prophetical have wholly escaped her attention; but the signs are not the less visible to those who will observe and understand them.

Is it all too late? Has the knell of Church influences been tolled? Are her glories departed for ever and beyond redemption? No! In a nobler, broader, purer, mightier spirit, the power of the Messiah has yet to be manifested. There are already dawning of the grander light with which futurity is pregnant. It will not be hid under clerical bushels, but shine forth from every lofty hill; it will not be the monopoly of an "elected" few, but the heritage of the enfranchised many, and its consummation will be the redemption of all.

How far the existing ecclesiastical machinery may hereafter accommodate itself to the inevitable, irresistible movement, remains to be seen. There are watchmen in the towers who already tell us of what is visible in the distance. There are voices crying (are they "in the wilderness"?), "Prepare the way of the Lord!" The arsenal of the Church, we have been told, has arms for every combat and for every combatant: they will be put to the proof. A new Jerusalem is announced; its portals will be assuredly opened. Will the Church conduct its followers thither?

But let not the clergy believe that they alone possess the keys by which the heavenly courts are to be made accessible,—that they are the sole depositaries, the sole interpreters, of eternal truth. Such blindness can only lead the blind to the ditch of perdition. While grasping at the shadow, the substance of power will pass away. Yet, if it were possible that the discipline of adversity should teach a lesson even to the pride of Rome, how eloquently has it spoken—is it now speaking! None but the obstinately deaf can fail to hear; and from the Eternal City—from the Vatican—from the *Santissimo* himself, the voice of alarm is the loudest, the most unmistakeable.

Sir Isaac Newton thought that the world would pass through an epoch of general scepticism to the recognition of a purer and nobler form of Christian faith. As the reaction of uncontrolled despotism creates a fierce democracy, so extreme credulity vibrates to utter unbelief. The garments of superstition are sometimes thrown off, leaving him who wore them to a naked infidelity. But this is neither a natural nor a tolerable position. There are wants that must be supplied, and the cravings after spiritual guidance are among them. The soul has its hungerings and thirstings, for which emptiness will not provide. Religious yearnings are so assimilated with, so engrafted into, our very physical organization, that they can never be wholly uprooted. Both in the affections and in the intellect are vacancies which must be filled by what is not of the earth, earthly.

The existing state of the religious mind in Italy is most instructive. In the northern and central provinces, the power of the priesthood seems smitten with paralysis. Roman Catholicism is repudiated, but no refuge is sought in Protestantism or any other of the forms of Christian faith. The tone of the contadini when speaking of the clergy falls strangely on the ears of those who only knew Italy as of old. Excommunication is laughed at in the public squares, and the best wine commonly bears the name of *Scommunica*. "They cursed our vineyards," say the peasants, in reference to the anathemas of the Church against the political movements, "and our vintages have been all the more abundant!"

Florence, Jan. 9, 1861.

J. B.

FATE.

'Tis the best use of Fate to teach a fatal courage. Go face the fire at sea, or the cholera in your friend's house, or the burglar in your own, or what danger lies in the way of duty, knowing you are guarded by the cherubim of Destiny. If you believe in Fate to your harm, believe it, at least, for your good.—*Emerson's Conduct of Life.*

THE HYMNOLOGY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.*

A change has, however, been introduced into the psalmody of the Unitarian church. The same element of speculation and mysticism which first dimmed and then debased the pure gold of scriptural truth, and led men insensibly away from the simple worship of the primitive church by the blandishments of sacred song, has come into operation in a body in which there once prevailed the chastest adoration of the Most High God, and a consequent abstinence from the invocation of Jesus Christ. What else but speculative mysticism is the correct description of worship as "an attitude which our nature assumes not for a purpose but from an emotion,"—as if every emotion worth entertaining did not shape itself into a purpose, and as if every purpose did not imply a corresponding emotion? Worship without a purpose is worship without an object; and worship which is only an emotion, like faith without works, "is dead, being alone." But not with worship in the abstract have Christian societies to do. Their privilege is to worship "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." To this devout act they are prompted by the deepest and most reverent love. Here the emotion begets a purpose, and the purpose is accomplished in the outpouring of the adoring gratitude which forms its essence. But Christian worship is worship inspired and guided by Christ. It is therefore not an "attitude" assumed at will, but a habit inwrought in the soul under the watchful and fostering eye of intelligence. As such, it is the voice not of one side of the mind, but of the whole mind, the reasoning as well as the emotional faculties, of the moral no less than the æsthetical nature. If, indeed, predominance is given to any of our powers, it is certainly not to the imagination, but rather to the faculty of spiritual knowledge, or that deep, vivid, personal experience which ensues from the earnest application of the entire spirit of man to the great things of God, and the answer of the Spirit of God in the quickened and renewed spirit of man. Worship is the voice of faith.

The result, which makes Christian worshipers into "children of the light" (Luke xvi. 8; Ephes. v. 8; 1 Thess. v. 5), delivering them from the power of darkness and translating them into the kingdom of God's dear Son (Coloss. i. 13), uncovers to them the mysteries of their being and of God's designs in Christ (Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 51; Ephes. i. 9, iii. 3, 4, 9), and so enables them to pray in truth as well as in spirit (John iv. 23), and with the understanding also (1 Cor. xiv. 15), because they know what they worship (John iv. 22). If Christ himself may be believed, such are the worshipers whom the Father seeks to worship Him (John iv. 23, 24). Are they one with those who identify religion

* Continued from p. 90.

with mystery? How, then, can their spiritual wants be met by poems selected because they "shed forth the conceptions of a mind possessed with the religious or mysterious conception of God, of life and death, of duty, of futurity"?

True Christian devotion is an intelligent act. The soul of the Christian knows whom it adores; it knows also why it adores; and knowing the Object of its adoration, it abstains from worshiping any but the only true and living God whom Christ revealed, and who in consequence is not Christ. That the knowledge is perfect is not affirmed; but though imperfect, it is clear, definite, enkindling and endearing, as far as it goes, if only because it sees and meditates the image of the invisible Father in the visible Son. No "metaphysical accuracy" is attempted in this view, but a distinct as well as vivid and devout apprehension of God under the qualities, especially the captivating and ennobling qualities of a Father, ascribed to Him alike by the words, the deeds and the life of Christ. Hence a hymn, like every act of Christian homage, is an efflux of the whole man, and as such is as various as the nature whose word and whose image it is. How narrow, then, the definition which makes a hymn demand no more than "truth of impression," possibly "reached through the boldest departure from precise truth of detail," as if it were the same thing whether you worshiped a *fetiche*, provided you did worship, or the Maker of the universe! Latitudinarianism so unqualified engenders indifferentism, and indifferentism is the parent of infidelity; for if you may worship any object, there is no object which you ought to worship; and so, with the removal of the ethical obligation in religion, you sap its foundation and cast down its throne. It is a less general, but not, in our judgment, a less fatal, objection to this æsthetical kind of worship, that it is not only pure "will-worship," and, as man-made, so condemned of God, but a tacit renunciation of the rule of scriptural authority, and that on a point on which men have ever shewn themselves weak, vacillating and prone to the wrong, if only the more attractive; and around which, if the Bible may be believed, God, through successive centuries and in various ways, had, so to say, taken special pains to throw a high, strong and impregnable wall of defence. As at least an ignoring of the authority of the Bible, it is an ignoring of Unitarianism; and as an ignoring of the express teachings and clear example of Christ, it is an ignoring of Christianity. If consistently followed out, the principle would equalize the sacred song of all religions, and make it proper to introduce into Christian psalmody poems from the Vedas of Hindostan and recitals from the Zendavesta of Persia. Equally would it justify supplications to Christ, though Christ has forbidden requests to himself, since worship is an "emotion" and not "a purpose," and "truth of impression" may be gained, provided only the emotion is felt and cherished. And

yet the volume in question bears in its title the description of "Hymns for the Christian Church and Home." Is there no "purpose" here? "Hymns for the *Christian Church*" surely ought to be hymns conceived in the spirit and directed to the purposes of Christ. Were these hymns really so, they would follow Christ's example as to the Object of worship, and carefully abstain from everything like the worship of Christ himself. It is not so; alas! it is not so. Witness this ode:

Even the Winds and the Sea obey him (202).

Lord! thou didst arise and say
To the troubled waters, "Peace!"
And the tempest died away;
Down they sank the foamy seas;
And a calm and heaving sleep
Spread o'er all the glassy deep;
All the azure lake serene
Like another heaven was seen.
Lord! thy gracious word repeat
To the billows of the proud;
Quell the tyrant's martial heat,
Quell the fierce and changing crowd:
Then the earth shall find repose
From its restless strife and woes;
And an imaged heaven appear
On our world of darkness here.

If this is not worship offered to Christ, we know not what worship is. Here Jesus, represented as having supreme control over the material and spiritual world, is invoked directly, though living only in the world of spirits, and asked to bestow religious gifts of the highest kind and the widest reach on the suppliants. What else can be presented in the worship of Almighty God? More emphatic because more express is the worship of Christ in the following stanzas from the 328th hymn:

O thou to whose all-searching sight
The darkness shineth as the light!
Search, prove my heart; it pants for thee;
O burst these bonds and set it free!

If in the darksome wild I stray,
Be thou my light, be thou my way;
No fraud nor violence I fear,
Nor foes, O Lord, while thou art near.

Saviour! where'er thy steps I see,
Dauntless, untired, I'd follow thee!
O let thy hand support me still,
And lead me to thy holy hill.

If rough and thorny be the way,
My strength proportion to my day;
Till toil and grief and pain shall cease,
Where all is calm and joy and peace.

We indicate the following hymns as containing elements which, with our Unitarian faith, it would be idolatrous in us to use, namely, Nos. 202, 208, 209, 211, 212, 234, 239, 246, 255, 256, 328, 442, 469, 475, 500, 504, 569, 641. We transcribe some of the verses:

O thou that in its wildest hour
 Didst rule the tempest's mood,
 Send thy meek spirit forth in power,
 Soft on our souls to brood !

Thou that didst bow the billow's pride,
 Thy mandate to fulfil,
 O speak to passion's raging tide,
 Speak and say, "*Peace, be still!*"

Welcome, O welcome to our hearts, Lord ! here
 Thou hast a temple too, and full as dear
 As that in Zion, and as full of sin ;
 How long shall thieves and robbers dwell therein ?
 Enter and chase them forth and cleanse the floor !
 Destroy their strength, that they may never more
 Profane with traffic vile that holy place,
 Which thou hast chosen there to set thy face.
 And then if our stiff tongues shall silent be
 In praises of thy finished victory,
 The temple-stones shall cry, and loud repeat,
 Hosanna ! and thy glorious footsteps greet.

Great Sun of Righteousness, arise !
 Bless the dark world with heavenly light ;
 Thy gospel makes the simple wise,
 Thy laws are pure, thy judgments right.
 Thy noblest wonders, Lord, we view
 In souls renewed and sins forgiven ;
 O cleanse my sins, my soul renew,
 And make thy word my guide to heaven.

O thou by whom we come to God,
 The life, the truth, the way !
 The path of prayer thyself hast trod ;
 Lord ! teach us how to pray.

Thou, O Lord, in tender love,
 Dost all my burthens bear.
 Lift my heart to things above,
 And fix it ever there !
 Calm on tumult's wheel I sit,
 Midst busy multitudes alone,
 Meekly waiting at thy feet
 Till all thy will be done.

Wake not, O mother, sounds of lamentation !
Weep not, O widow, weep not hopelessly !
Strong is his arm, the bringer of salvation ;
Strong is the word of God to succour thee.

Change then, O sad one, grief to exultation ;
Worship and fall before Messiah's knee ;
Strong was his arm, the bringer of salvation ;
Strong was the word of God to succour thee.

The compiler aims, we are told in the Preface, at "general truth of impression." The foregoing citations suffice to shew that the truth secured is not the truth of the Christian Scriptures. The passages from Unitarian authorities which preceded suffice to shew that as little is the truth secured the truth of the Unitarian church of Great Britain. What standard, then, was observed ? The "general truth of impression" seems to have been simply the truth of the compiler's own mind. That he should follow his own truth is quite right; but that he should lead others, with their eyes closed, he does not wish; and will therefore thank us for thus putting in fair and open issue the question, Does not the prayer to Christ embedded in the "Hymns for the Christian Church and Home" disqualify the Collection for use in the public worship of those whose fundamental principle is that the God and Father of Christ is the only proper Object of religious worship ? Either Christ is a creature or he is God. If the latter, he of right demands our worship, and then Unitarianism is false and misleading. If the former, to worship him is to worship a creature, and the worship of a creature is idolatry. To allege that you worship the divine in the human, is to make use of the pretext put forth alike by Roman and Pagan idolatry. If valid at all, it is universally valid; and so this worship in the Protestant church stands on the same level as the false worships of Italy, Spain and Hindostan. It may be added that the peril and the penalty are alike in all. The peril is to depart further and further from the Creator. The penalty is to be engrossed in and debased by the worship of the creature. He that begins by worshiping the cross-bearer is in danger of ending by worshiping the cross itself. Evidence to this effect is already before the reader. Evidence of the same nature might be multiplied a hundred-fold. If you plead that prayer is not worship, you plead what is unsustainable, for prayer acknowledges in the being addressed the power to grant the request; and he that is able to grant the requests of all Christendom can be no other than the Supreme God, possessed equally of omniscience and omnipotence; for the granting of even one prayer must be felt in all the dependencies and issues of the spiritual universe. In truth, such a bestowal is a divine prerogative, the exercise of which depends solely on the will of the Almighty. He that asks a gift from

Christ, by the very act converts Christ into God, and so, by enthroning the Son, dethrones the Father.

With what disregard of scriptural language this school of theology handles scriptural subjects is shewn in the invocation of Christ found at the beginning of the 164th poem of "Chants, Hymns and Anthems," which runs thus:

Incarnate Word! who, wont to dwell
In lowly shape and cottage cell,
Didst not refuse a guest to be
At Cana's poor festivity.

Naturally enough, divinity is ascribed to this "Incarnate Word" in hymn 241 :

The bending angels stooped to see
The lisping infant clasp thy knee,
And smile, as in a father's eye,
Upon thy mild divinity.

What the comparison in the third line may mean we do not know, but we know that there is no scriptural authority for the statement the stanza makes. The lack of such authority reminds us of the laxness with which our æsthetical theologians make declarations which the Bible only can warrant, but which the Bible does not justify. Great and painful is the contrast exhibited by this latitude when seen side by side with the reverent abstinence of our older ministers from even indirectly asserting as divine truth anything which is not written or at least clearly implied in the Bible.

Christ, being God incarnate, may well be supplicated as in these lines :

Jesus, Saviour, sympathize
With thy servants' agonies ;
In thy lifetime thou hast known
Racking pains that made thee moan—
Pain of body, grief of mind,
Shame and suffering combined.

With thy sanctifying hand
Touch me gently and command
Some soft drops of dewy balm
To be shed with potent charm ;
Comfort was to thee imparted,
Comfort thou the broken-hearted.

Similar entreaties are put up to Christ in at least thirty compositions in this Collection. By such conduct the wall of partition between a scriptural worship and an unscriptural one is either hidden or demolished. We see no reason why those who can conscientiously use these invocations to Christ should hesitate to utter similar invocations found in the Litany of the English Episcopal and the Roman Catholic Church. It is not God who

is here worshiped. It is not even the divine in Christ on which the thought is fixed, but on a divine being who suffered pain in his lifetime! *Horresco referens*—a pang seizes our heart while writing these words, and while reflecting that they are placed to be sung in what is thought to be Unitarian worship. A devotion whose misty heats hide the clear and sharply-marked boundary-lines that divide scriptural truth from scholastic speculation and fanciful reveries, may not unnaturally want that chasteness of spiritual taste which distinguishes minds which, like that of Watts and Barbauld, are deeply imbued with the pure and lofty spirit of the Bible. We are therefore more hurt than surprised at the lines,—

command
Some soft drops of dewy balm
To be shed with potent charm.

“Balm” we know, and “dewy” we know, but what “dewy balm” may be we are at a loss to conceive. As what is dewy is in itself soft, the “soft” before drops might have been dispensed with. These drops, however, are to be shed “with potent charm.” A “potent charm” carries the mind back to the black arts of the dark ages, and calls up associations of any but a sacred or scriptural kind. And then “balm” and “charm” are given as a rhyme! A more marked violation of taste is found in the hymn in which a parallel is run between Socrates and Jesus.

The Sage his cup of hemlock quaffed,
And calmly drained the fatal draught;
Such pledge did Grecian justice give
To one who taught them how to live.

The Christ in piety assured,
The anguish of his cross endured;
Such pangs did Jewish bigots try
On him who taught us how to die.

'Mid prison walls the Sage could trust
That men would grow more wise and just;
From Calvary's mount the Christ could see
The dawn of immortality.

Extremes do indeed meet often, but never in a broader contrast than when the same congregation sings this poor, ill-expressed, moralizing and almost pagan talk in one part of their religious services, and in another puts up invocations and entreaties to Christ as the “Incarnate Word” possessed “of mild divinity.” Bad examples are contagious. Accordingly our Transatlantic brethren are not free from reprehensible laxity in their service of sacred song. The following hymn appears in “A Book of Hymns and Tunes for the Sunday-school, the Congregation and the Home,” recently published by Rev. Samuel Longfellow:

Ah, dearest Jesus, holy child,
Make thee a bed, soft, undefiled,
Within my heart, that it may be
A quiet chamber kept for thee.

My heart for very joy doth leap,
My lips no more can silence keep ;
I too must sing with joyful tongue
That sweetest ancient cradle-song.

Glory to God in highest heaven,
And unto men sweet peace be given !
While angels sing with pious mirth
A glad new year to all the earth.

Surely the vigorous manhood of thought and propriety of utterance which used to characterize our Unitarian poetry as well as prose, must have much degenerated ere one of our ministers could publish for use in "the Sunday-school, the Congregation and the Home," a direct prayer to the infant Jesus, thus rivalling the Romanist on his knees before the *bambino*. Here, too, the sense breaks down as well as the theology; for how can an infant make a bed, and how can a bed be a bed and a bed-chamber? Besides, the song of the angels was sung at the birth of Christ, and the birth of Christ is not commonly identified in the sentiment of the church with New-year's-day, but with Christmas-day. We think it our duty to expose these falsities of thought and taste, the rather because similar transgressions are found in a volume which has found acceptance in England, namely, "The Harp and the Cross."

It must not, however, be thought that the infection has spread generally through the theologians and divines of the Unitarian church in the United States. Lest what we have just said should produce such an impression, we quote the following excellent remarks from Dr. Lamson's valuable work recently published, viz., "The Church of the First Three Centuries:"

"Origen contends that Christ is not the object of supreme worship; and that prayer, properly such, ought never to be addressed to him, but is to be offered to the God of the universe, through his only-begotten Son, who, as our intercessor and high-priest, bears our petitions to the throne of his Father and our Father, of his God and our God. On this subject he is very full and explicit. 'Prayer is not to be directed,' he says, 'to one begotten, not even to Christ himself; but to the God and Father of the universe alone, to whom also our Saviour prayed, and to whom he teaches us to pray. When his disciples said, 'Teach us to pray,' he taught them to pray, not to himself, but to the Father, saying, 'Our Father, who art in heaven.' For if the Son,' he continues, 'be different from the Father in essence, as we have proved in another place, we must either pray to the Son, and not to the Father, or to both, or to the Father alone. But no one is so absurd as to maintain that we are to pray to the Son, and not to the Father. If prayer is addressed to both, we ought to use the plural number, and say, 'Forgive, bless, preserve

ye us,' or something like it; but as this is not a fit mode of address, and no example of it occurs in the Scriptures, it remains that we pray to the Father of the universe alone.' He adds, 'But as he who would pray as he ought must not pray to him who himself prays, but to Him whom Jesus our Lord taught us to invoke in prayer (namely, the Father), so no prayer is to be offered to the Father without him; which he clearly shews when he says (John xvi. 23, 24), 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he shall give it you. Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name; ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.' For he does not say, 'Ask me,' nor 'Ask the Father,' simply; but, 'If ye shall ask the Father in my name, he shall give it you.' For until Jesus had thus taught them, no one had asked the Father in the name of the Son; and what he said was true, 'Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name.' And again: 'What are we to infer,' asks Origen, 'from the question, 'Why call ye me good? There is none good but one,—God the Father.' What but that be meant to say, 'Why pray to me? It is proper to pray to the Father alone, to whom I pray, as ye learn from the Scriptures. For ye ought not to pray to him who is constituted by the Father high-priest for you, and who has received the office of advocate from the Father, but through the high-priest and advocate, who can be touched with the feeling of your infirmities, having been tempted in all respects as ye are, but, by the gift of the Father, tempted without sin. Learn, therefore, how great a gift ye have received of my Father; having obtained, through generation in me, the spirit of adoption, by which ye have a title to be called the sons of God and my brethren. As I said to the Father concerning you, by the mouth of David, 'I will declare thy name to my brethren; in the midst of the assembly I will sing praise to thee.' But it is not according to reason for a brother to be addressed in prayer by those who are glorified by the same Father. Ye are to pray to the Father alone, with and through me.'

"This we take to be sound Unitarianism. Indeed, the question of the impropriety of addressing the Son in prayer could not have been better argued by the most strenuous advocate for the Divine Unity at the present day."—P. 150.

A review of the general import of this essay discloses to us three ages of sacred song: 1, the age of gold; 2, the age of silver; 3, the age of brass. It is sad to think that the Unitarian church, which used to consider itself called to honour and restore the age of gold, should now, in any of its professed members, find its pleasure in or near the age of brass. Against such a decline in spiritual purity we raise our voice in sorrow and rebuke. We hope the disease is not too deeply seated for eradication. We call on all who love a scriptural faith, a simple theology and genuine poetry, to withstand the growing evil which we have thus laid bare, and to restore the psalmody of our congregations to its proper tone of sound sense, deep, vivid and tender feeling, and sterling English taste.

JOHN R. BEARD.

ADDRESS AT THE CLOSE OF THE ANNUAL EXAMINATION OF
THE UNITARIAN HOME MISSIONARY BOARD AT MANCHESTER,
JANUARY 23, 1861.

BY REV. R. L. CARPENTER, B.A.*

GENTLEMEN,—At the request of my senior colleague (the Rev. H. Green, M.A.), I have agreed to say a few words at the close of this annual examination. We shall present to the Committee our report of what appears to have been the progress of the students. I may say, in general terms, that most of the answers which have been read give very satisfactory proof that the benefits afforded by this Institution have been conscientiously improved. My friend Mr. Hincks is to speak the word peculiarly appropriate to the students: my remarks will be addressed to the supporters of the Board.

Whilst listening to the examinations, I could not but be impressed with some marked differences between your course and that at York, while I was a student there. Your object is to train, not scholars, but missionaries; while at York the missionary movement was rather tolerated than encouraged. With evident reluctance our venerated tutor, Mr. Wellbeloved, informed us, in our fourth year, that it was the wish of the Committee that we should take our turn in supplying the mission stations of Welburn and Malton: and when one of my zealous fellow-students distributed Unitarian tracts in a village near York, his conduct was gravely rebuked, and he was told that, as students, we were not supposed to have attained to any definite views of doctrinal truth.† I do not say that this was unwise. In these times, when those who should be learners are eager to be teachers—when men are willing freely to give, who have not freely received, and to bestow what they can scarcely be said to have made their own—it is well that those who are to maintain the character of our denomination for scholarship and sound learning should be *students* throughout their college course: they will find the distractions of active life beset them soon enough.

* We had intended also inserting the Address of Dedication delivered in Cross-Street chapel by Rev. Thomas Hincks, but the Committee of the Missionary Board have naturally enough desired to give increased interest to their Annual Report by printing it as a part of that document.

† We are desired by Mr. Carpenter to add a note to this part of his address, to the effect that he learns from other students of Manchester College, York, who preceded him, that Mr. Wellbeloved in their case did not discourage their taking part in missionary plans. Every one must feel that there is reason and truth in the objection to those who have but imperfectly learnt, undertaking to teach others. To a conscientious man like Mr. Wellbeloved, so thorough in everything he undertook, this objection would present itself with great force. For our own part, assisting as we did in the early missionary efforts at York, we remember with respect and gratitude Mr. Wellbeloved's forbearance and patience. The time and thought occupied by these village preachings did certainly sometimes interfere with College work; but our memory is not charged with a cold look or a word of remonstrance on the part of our venerated teacher.—ED. C.R.

Yet it was felt, when the College was removed to Manchester, that it was not enough for those who were to be our pastors to have a mere academic training: and even out of the very excellence of our *present* collegiate course, there arose a want of something to supply a need which no college could meet. Not many wise, not many learned, are chosen: and now, as in the days of the first preaching of the gospel, earnestness and life are even more required than culture. We must not forget that the most earnest of the apostles was also the most cultivated: Paul, who had acquired a Greek education at Tarsus, and had learnt rabbinical lore at the feet of Gamaliel, was as ardent an apostle as the unlearned men who spoke in the provincial dialect of Galilee: his weighty and powerful letters are our chief apostolic literature, whilst he was also the most laborious and effective of preachers: yet there was but one Paul; there were many fishermen.

A college course of six years must be commenced at an age when the student can scarcely know his qualifications for the ministry. We have such a confidence in the truth of our views, that we suppose that every year of study must increase a student's faith. In point of fact, however, many remember their college course as distracted with doubts which had never before occurred to them: they were, in one sense, theoretically *sceptics*—examining, questioning, *looking at* doctrines, rather than holding them. In the midst of the overweening dogmatism of the orthodox sects, and the dogmatism, no less overweening, of iconoclastic infidels, it is well that there should be a retired refuge where *perhaps* and *probably* are recognized words,—where doubt and hesitation are legitimate—where the family of *Search* is safe from the noisy arrogance of the *Know-all*s. But a grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of our York system does not imply a doubt that there was room for another institution. You invite here those who are of an age to choose a profession, and who in many instances have given satisfactory proof of their qualifications for it. So far from presuming that they cannot possibly have any doctrinal convictions, you take for granted that they wish to teach what Unitarians believe to be the doctrine of the gospel of Christ. If in their course of study their views should change, they are free to depart; but whilst remaining with you, they are Unitarian students. I therefore approve of the voluntary examination (on the Ecclesiastical History of the Unitarian Church) conducted by my friend Mr. H. A. Bright, and it is a ground of great congratulation that a Master of Arts of Cambridge should be able to preside at it, without doing anything inconsistent with his University standing; but I am free to say that nothing which we were ever taught at York would qualify me to judge of the correctness of the answers.

There are other subjects on which the students of our College

would never have dreamt of writing in the common hall:—need I refer to Dr. Beard's examination on Missionaryism and Unitarianism, and Mr. Herford's on the Mission in the Home? Living in the midst of a manufacturing district, the supporters of this Institution have learnt the value of the half-time system; and thus some of the hours of your students are spent in the work of the ministry, others in the cultivation of their minds. In this way they have an advantage which we at York never possessed. We were but little trained for the pulpit, still less for pastoral duty. I am sorry to find, however, that, from the extreme demand for the Sunday services of the students, they have been of late debarred from one important means of improvement. In a town like Manchester, where there are so many distinguished preachers, it would be especially useful for our future missionaries to hear our own ministers, and also to become acquainted with the mode of address by which our fellow-christians seem most influenced: their tutors may help them to discriminate that which is good to the use of edifying and deserves imitation, from that which only wins an injurious popularity. In the coming session there will be a large addition to the number of students, and I hope they may be permitted a privilege which in after years they may desire in vain.

It has often occurred to me, that, were I rich enough to found a scholarship for Manchester students in London, it should be to enable those who have finished their course of academical study to spend a year with one of our most experienced ministers to the poor, whether settled with a regular congregation, or a domestic missionary. They should be his curates, having a cure of souls under one who should, at the same time, not neglect the cure of theirs. They would thus learn what no books could teach them: they would walk the moral hospitals with an approved physician, and would watch his treatment: they would have a friend and counsellor at hand, not only to guide, but to encourage them, and to supply from his greater experience suggestions and hopes when they were perplexed by failure.

You anticipate, in your missionary course, what I think should be a necessary sequel to our College. Those who have come to prepare for missionary life are here in a two-fold capacity: they are students and apprentices: they learn the theory, and are at once called to practice. The danger of course is, lest by attempting too much nothing should be done well; and that those hours of calm and uninterrupted study should be unduly abridged, on which some look back regretfully in after-life, as a peculiar privilege of their college days. It will be an evil if any should be so well satisfied with the approval which they receive for their active work, that they neglect the mental culture for which they will never again have such an opportunity; if they are so eager to eat the sweet fruit of their toil, that they put by little for the

seed. It would be worthless and false compliment were I to pretend that I have heard no papers which seemed to excite this fear, and which might have been those of vague and declamatory preachers, rather than of close students: other papers, however, by the same writers, shewed careful and accurate study: and your respected tutors confirm my impression, that, as a rule, the students manifest a decided desire for intellectual improvement and earnest efforts to attain it. Most of them have come here with a deep feeling of the evils of the ignorance which surrounds them, and which they must do their utmost to enlighten. After all, it is not so much what we acquire at college, as the habits of study that we form, of which we find the advantage in after-life. Many of us have lost much that we once knew; but we have acquired fresh stores, if we have retained our student nature. In these days of progress, a man who only knows what he carried with him from college, will find himself distanced by those who never had his opportunities in youth, but who have made opportunities for themselves in manhood, and have devoted hours, in every week, to unflinching, resolute, persevering, hearty intellectual toil.

In some respects there is, then, even an intellectual advantage in your plan. You make no artificial breaks in life. Your students cannot pretend, when they leave you, that they need be students no longer. What they now are *with* your help, they are to be hereafter *through* it. Here they are to acquire the habits of self-culture and active labour, of learning and of teaching, which they are never to lose. You do not ship them off as emigrants to a new land, furnished with the unused tools that have been moulded here; but you have taught them to fashion the tools which they are to work with: you have gone with them to the fields of labour: and you have a well-grounded trust that if they faithfully discharge the varied duties in which they are now exercised, they will prove workmen that need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

CHRISTIANITY BETTER LEARNED FROM THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT THAN THE EPISTLES.

THEY are rightly described as "mistaken religionists" who regard the Sermon on the Mount as not Christianity at all, but a mere collection of moral precepts. And it is well added, "It seems extremely startling to say that He who came to this world expressly to preach the gospel, should in the most elaborate of all his discourses omit to do so; it is indeed something more than startling, it is absolutely revolting, to suppose that the letters of those who spoke of Christ, should contain a more perfectly developed, a freer and fuller Christianity than is to be found in Christ's own words."—*F. W. Robertson's Sermons.*

DR. HUNTINGTON'S CONVERSION TO TRINITARIANISM.*

THE twentieth of Dr. Huntington's sermons bears this title : "Life, Salvation and Comfort for Man in the Divine Trinity." The notices of the sermon are reprinted from the "Christian Examiner," the "Monthly Religious Magazine," the "Monthly Journal of the Unitarian Association," and the "Christian Register." To these are added two sermons by the Rev. T. Starr King, the aim of which is to prove that, whatever the doctrine of the New Testament is, it is clearly not Trinitarian ; and one by Dr. Dewey on "The Primitive Christian Creed." American orthodoxy appears to have gained in Dr. Huntington a convert of whose sincerity and earnestness his former associates speak in the highest terms, a preacher of considerable popular ability, a man from whom they are parted with manifest sorrow. It is but a short time since he published seven reasons for being an Unitarian, and he has been occupied for twenty years in the Unitarian ministry. Though he seems to stand alone in his secession, it was natural that when he stated his reasons for the change, his earlier friends should publicly consider them, and endeavour to fortify anew their own position. Their replies are of varied ability, though for the most part too greatly narrowed by the peculiar character of the charge they had to meet. The field of reply seemed large, for the Doctor defends everything Trinitarian ; but the ground on which he really stands is so limited, that it would hardly seem to have been worth the controversy. "The New Discussion of the Trinity" is therefore a somewhat imposing title to give to what is properly an examination of certain individual opinions held by Dr. Huntington.

To say that he now upholds extreme opinions would be an affectation of mildness in the use of terms. His faith is henceforth of enormous appetite, greedy of extremes. Athanasianism itself is hardly Trinitarian enough for his new spiritual credulity. And he holds it in no vague, mincing fashion, as some have done in our own country, presuming to find in the notorious Creed, so called, a balm of universal charity and token of God's fatherly love for all men. He believes in the true dark colour of the blackness of eternal wrath, and that the elect could only have been redeemed from the utter depravity of all human natures by the sufferings of a dying God. And all that usually accompanies such beliefs,—the inconsequential reasonings, the assumptions, the spiritual arrogance, the rhetorical sentiment,—assist the author in their enforcement with a degree of naturalness and

* Christian Believing and Living. Sermons by F. D. Huntington, D.D., Preacher to the University and Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard College. Boston, U.S. 1860.

The New Discussion of the Trinity. Notices of Professor Huntington's recent Defence of that Doctrine; together with Sermons by Rev. Thomas Starr King and Dr. Orville Dewey. Boston, U.S. 1860.

unction indicative of a nature set free at length from the icy fetters of reason, bursting into the enjoyment of a licence for which it has long sighed and laboured in vain. Surely so great a change is not to be explained in Dr. Huntington, nor guarded against in any possible future convert, by any "New Discussion of the Trinity." The true question is as to the whole manner of thought and feeling, which must have long anticipated the mere altered dogmatic position, of one who can describe in the general tone of these discourses the relations between men and their Maker. As he seems himself to intimate, Dr. Huntington was Trinitarian in feeling before his intellectual Unitarian difficulties could be overcome. To judge from certain passages in the replies, and from a too manifest eagerness which most of them display to find some formula of Trinity in scripture and in philosophy, one would be inclined to think that the line of intellectual separation must have appeared to him but slender between the opposing beliefs. He might have supposed himself to be now doing what his compatriots hesitated to do, in their too scrupulous regard for the mere critical interpretations of holy scripture. This is indeed the spirit of his triumph over all their too cold investigations; and if there be many amongst them who sympathize with his general views, they may at any moment as easily overleap the barrier of Unitarian reasons. Trinitarianism is to him a symbol much more than a set of doctrines, and he is at length landed in a clime of heated sentiment whither he must have for some time painfully drifted.

Under ordinary circumstances, a simple change of views in an individual, however much respected in his own circle of friends, would have for us comparatively little interest. The current of religious thought runs here so steadily, if sometimes for a while imperceptibly, in our direction, that we could only be astonished at any single person who should abandon us on professed grounds of rational conviction. But the peculiarities of the present case suggest reflection upon our own states of feeling in relation to orthodoxy, as also upon the feelings of the orthodox themselves which hinder their cool research of reason into the truth which we maintain. Dr. Huntington has not, indeed, a logical mind. His friendly opponents have had but a too easy task in exposing his defects of judgment and learning. He tempts attack by his unguarded rhetorical flourishes. His theories, moreover, do not mutually cohere. He seems to think that an extreme doctrine must comprise every form of belief that bears a similar name. He would be soundly censured by our own orthodox heads of the church for a certain rashness of over-statement into which he is often led by his too avaricious zeal of belief, if English divines ever troubled themselves with the movements of thought abroad. Nevertheless, in the sermons before us, the author has very clearly indicated what he would never have had the logic to

define,—the true basis of orthodoxy, in Trinity or any other special dogma. What is man's proper attitude and state of feeling before God? One of utter abjectness, shattered completely by indefinable terror, nerveless, helpless, hopeless, under a sensation—it can hardly be called a sense—of infinite guiltiness, from which no effort of will can save him, no friendly counsel, no promise of God Himself, not the free grace of the Father, which in this view is impossible,—nothing save the awful conviction that the blood of God-in-man has ransomed him to pardon and eternal life. The author so writes of man in his relations with God. Therefore must he have a Trinity. This idea is the root of all theological fictions whatever. Whoever tamps with Trinitarianisms should know that he has nothing to do with any such forms of faith if he does not cherish the root-belief of them all. He may think to use them in scripture interpretation. He may strive to compromise in them his differences with orthodox churches. He may indulge in neoplatonic dreams of Trinities, or follow the wild Trinitarian speculations of the Absolute, of modern German professors. It is but idle words and toying. In what sense is God the Father of humanity? It is the sole question to solve: man falls then naturally into his just position, and either returns and rises to his embrace of love, or cowers under his awful, because eternally necessary, sovereign tyranny of vengeance. Thus alone is it determined for him whether the One or the Three can and may suffice for his worship and his hope of salvation.

By motives, therefore, not by reasons, is Trinitarianism supported, though few amongst the orthodox would as freely own to the truth as this late convert. He even apologizes for the employment of reason in religion. He says in the note to the sermon, speaking of the divine honours due to Christ,—

"In these observations we are not making 'rationality' a test for the reception of this doctrine, any more than of other religious and revealed truths. We only exhibit it as an advantage of the doctrine, that when faith has welcomed it, the intellect has its reward also, in discovering its internal harmonies and the beauty of its relations."

Suppose the voice of reason to be heard for a moment amidst the wailings of that prostration of despair which is the source of Dr. Huntington's, as of all orthodox belief in the Trinity, their only hope of salvation, and which therefore they assume must be true, whether the doctrine be scriptural or not, *since they want it*, —would it not insist upon a sounder basis for the doctrine of God than this morbid craving of self-reproach? The self-condemnation may be just and natural; but is it a necessary inference that only the suffering of Deity can subdue it and restore the soul to peace? Has the love of God no power, the sanctifying grace of God no regenerative force? Did Christ reveal, or had he to create or generate or bring into unwonted action, the

divine love of Him whom he declared to be alike his own Father and ours, our God as his? We have no word to say against self-reproach for sin. It is natural and right to feel it. We preach it as a duty, the fit way of return from every "prodigal" experience of wrong-doing; but there can be no "harmony" of truth to fact in humiliations such as are here insisted upon,—a sorrow for sin so mystical that for all men indiscriminately, "when it has once come in and taken hold of our souls, no language, no penitent's self-reproach, no prodigal's cry of unworthiness, not Augustine's burning confessions, not the hot anguish of the fifty-first Psalm, is overwrought or too earnest." (P. 344.) And in which a creature is supposed to say to its Maker, "Thou didst shape and fashion my body, and in thy book all my members were written; yet selfishness has been in my heart and veins, in my blood and my bones, in my nerves and my motions. I am 'shapen in iniquity.'" (P. 346.) As though the strong speech of the Jewish king, uttered from a conscience burdened with the oppressive memory of a recent murder, could fitly represent the emotions of all men at their conversion—nay, at any time—whatever their early life had been; and this to support a system of doctrine which even that man's guilty experience would deny, who is believed to have received forgiveness though he only sought it in penitence, without a thought of the Divine suffering required, they say, to make that forgiveness possible.

But any speech of reason must be powerless in presence of the tumultuous, passionate, tyrannic cravings of an imagination struggling and wailing in the abysses of despair,—a state of feeling which Dr. Huntington so vividly describes from an experience manifestly original and genuine,—a condition of mind, moreover, so desperately morbid and beyond the remedial powers of reason, that reason itself is perverted by it into an argument for its own destruction. Dr. Huntington no longer seeks to learn what truth is, but shapes it in his fancy to what he thinks it must be. It has to satisfy, not his judgment, but his needs, to use the peculiar language of the convict school in which his new degree is taken. If his despair requires a Trinity of Gods—it is the only question to ask—then "how clearly!" as he says, in astonishment at his own former blindness, this Trinity shall appear in every line of sacred scripture, or any other number which the boasted "millions of Christendom" have ever "needed" to believe in; for arithmetic is lost, he observes, in dealing with the spiritual and the infinite, and laughs at our poor, blind objection upon that head, which Mr. Mansell is supposed by his admirers to have finally and most conveniently disposed of. What can reason say in the ear of one who will only keep it near him in servile offices, who more than suspects it to have been the real "liar from the beginning"? He styles it "arrogant, self-asserting intellect." He objects to what he denominates "pride of the

brain." Unitarianism was not sufficiently mystic for his "spiritual faculty." Our estimates of things are all reversed. What we hold to be excellences, he counts as the defects of our doctrine. He is fearful of maintaining his present views in too hard and dogmatic a form, lest they should not contain enough of all the absurdities he desires them to embrace. He quotes without discrimination from all varieties of Trinitarians, not appearing to distinguish in the least the enormous differences between them. He is only eager to stand separated from everything Unitarian,—as we all should, he thinks, if we had but "hearts ready for the truth," and the "deeper want awakened" which he finds satisfied in nothing but the most extreme contrary faith. For all possible objections from "arithmetic, mechanics, common sense, psychology," to say nothing of holy scripture, he is prepared with the reply, "I know whom I have believed." He thinks with the orthodox generally that objections are temptations of the devil. They have, he says, "a proclivity to the negation of the glories of the gospel;" which is certainly true if his idea of those glories is correct, that they can only consist with his abased view of humanity,—offering a mystic, infinite, awful remedy for a mystic, indefinable, terrible inborn disorder of the nature. It is a remarkable circumstance that the most abandoned of men have upheld and do always most easily believe the doctrines which Dr. Huntington can only account for our not receiving by the singular judgment that we have "a spiritual faculty not in harmony with the truth." In like manner, when he is enumerating the large brotherhood of this faith, he does not pause to notice the persecuting bigotry which has always more or less attended it, the wicked lives of the majority of its professors, the shocking faction fights of which it has been the occasion. We infer that these things are not out of harmony with his "glories of the gospel." Demoniac bigotry he can take by the hand; he is horror-struck at the reasoning "proclivities" of the Unitarian intellect!

Dr. Huntington affirms that it is one intention of the revelation of the Trinity to inculcate humility. There must be some error in this. Mental prostration he must mean, which is not seldom accompanied by the utmost arrogance of temper. It is easy to create merit enough out of religious abasement, with which to override the weaker wisdom of the mere intellect. And it would be a curious thing to believe that one chief design of the doctrine it fails invariably to fulfil. Even the good Doctor, with all his caution, cannot avoid some display of the triumph of spiritual pride over the dim-sighted religious illumination of the poor, half-famished believers whom his enthusiastic "awakening" has left behind. As an example of the extraordinary power of self-deception which there may be in a "heart ready for" a certain conclusion, we quote the whole passage:

"And with charity let us try to keep humility; try to keep it the more, since one of the plainest offices of the special mystery of faith before us is to require and preserve this lowness of the Christian mind. Where the arrogant, self-asserting intellect has to veil its face, presumption in judgment may well lie still. If in all the circle of sacred themes there is one where both the dryness of speculation and the acerbity of polemics should be laid aside, where the method should be spiritual, the tone devout, and all the thoughts penetrated and tempered with the fragrance of holy affections, it surely is this."—P. 358.

He then proceeds to make the most exaggerated distortions of Unitarian views, and the most overbearing statements of his own, with a degree of assumption that would be sickening if we did not know that it belongs so naturally to Trinitarianism, that he has thus afforded the infallible evidence that he really believes in and has drunk of that water of bitterness. To think of presumption in judgment lying still, when he might have known that it is our strongest ground of proof against the doctrine, that it affects to define and reduce the mystery of the Infinite One by translating it into a mystification of unmeaning words, upon a false basis of reasoning, by inferences which the language of holy scripture does not warrant! It is an easy display of "lowness of mind" to exclaim against an opponent's "pride of brain," to use the peculiar language of the Professor, when he is too severely criticising an error in one's logic. Dr. Huntington has, in truth, so fully imbibed not only all, and more than all, the doctrine, but an incredible quantity also of the fallacies and blunders and cant with which it is nearly everywhere maintained, that we can hardly conceive him to have been for so many years an Unitarian at all, at least not one of any type with which we are acquainted.

The general view which we have given of Dr. Huntington's position will be justified from the consideration of the three chief arguments upon which the sermon dilates. We extract from the "*Monthly Religious Magazine*" of February, 1860, a fair summary of the whole, remarking only upon a distinction made by the writer, to which we attach comparatively little importance, between Trinity and Tripersonality. We understand such a distinction to have little more than a historical value, as clearly marking off from the true Trinitarians an immense majority who have borne the name, as in modern days Neander and Bunsen, though without the faintest profession of a real Trinitarian belief.

"The doctrine of the Trinity, or rather Tripersonality, for that is the form which it assumes in his statement,—and the two terms are by no means synonymous,—has with trifling exceptions been held by Christian believers ever and everywhere. Though truth is not determined by majorities, yet it is hardly credible that the Great Head of the church, who promised to be with it always, would suffer it to embrace a delusion so wide-spread and running through all the ages. To suppose this is painful, not to say irreverent, towards the Providence that has ever led and watched the true Christian Israel.

"This doctrine, or the system of which it forms a part, is essential to render Christianity practically an efficient and vital power in the world and in the human soul. Leave this out, and man fails to see the extent of sin and its terrible evil; piety wastes, the church declines, enthusiasm is chilled, prayer loses its efficacy, and the world reaps an easy harvest. Restore it, and the church becomes aggressive; the sinner is convinced and finds peace in believing, and devotion revives again."

"This doctrine, and the system to which it belongs, give unity to the Bible, and make all its disclosures and utterances fall into one majestic and consistent plan. From Genesis to the Apocalypse, the great themes of Incarnation and Redemption are all harmonizing, and make all difficulties of exegesis vanish; while to the Anti-trinitarian they are insurmountable, or require unnatural or laboured explanations." (New Discussion, pp. 144, 145.)

On each of these points, if the facts presented themselves to his mind under the imaginative, rhetorical form in which the preacher himself describes them, we cannot wonder that a feeble judgment should have been overborne and reduced to silence. A more uncandid statement we have never read than that given in the heated language of the Professor respecting the contrasted conditions of the orthodox and the contrary faiths. The colouring of both pictures is too uniform for real effect. It is a vice in oratory, no less than a defect of philosophic verity. The one is untruthfully warm and genial; the other, inconceivably cold and repulsive. With regard to his first grand argument, his opponents find it easy to reply on many grounds, and for the most part they have completely succeeded, chiefly by correcting his facts or by amending his estimates of fact. The following observations occur in one of the ablest papers of the volume before us, reprinted from the "*Christian Examiner*" of March, 1860, in which the fallacy of the appeal to numbers upon questions of theology is triumphantly exposed:

"'It is this truth,' says the preacher, 'which has kept its vigils by the weary processions of sufferers and consoled them.' We cannot of course disprove the truth of this assertion regarding a matter of which Omniscience alone can know. But we vainly attempt to figure to ourselves the husband bereft of the wife of his youth, the mother at the grave of her first-born, the orphaned child, turning for support and consolation, not to the blessed declarations of him who proclaimed himself 'the Resurrection and the Life,' 'In my Father's house are many mansions;' nor to the lofty strain of St. Paul, 'For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved,' &c.; but—for this is the Trinity which Dr. Huntington advocates—to the comfortable words of the Athanasian Creed: 'Whoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith. Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastinglly. And the catholic faith is, that we worship One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance,' &c.,—propositions which, whether they be true or false, would seem but imperfectly suited to such straits. The same consolations are

not available for all. For one Christian mourner who is comforted by the thought of the Trinity, there are thousands and hundreds of thousands who seek consolation in prayers to the Virgin and do abundantly find it. . . . Had we lived in the fifteenth century, and been of a critical, inquiring mind, we should probably have had this problem presented to us,—whether to receive or reject the Church doctrine of Transubstantiation. We should have found the argument from numbers and authority almost irresistible. The doctrine clearly prefigured in the Fathers. From the eighth century on, the leading authorities all on that side. And had we then had access to the Scriptures, we should there have found—what? No doubtful texts, but explicit declarations of our Lord, necessitating, if the doctrine were denied, what might seem to be desperate shifts of figurative interpretation in order to escape the binding conclusion of the sacramental *metabole*. And yet we should then most likely, as now, have found in our own consciousness a countervailing force which would not have suffered us to be of the Catholic church in that particular." (New Discussion, pp. 17, 18.)

Any person familiar with the sacred literature of the Papal community might have supposed the Doctor's appeal to authority of great names and numbers to have been copied from the habitual preaching of that Church, and he would wonder that an argument which could be carried by such a man so far, was not extended to other points of theology not yet included in his creed. But the Doctor is greatly influenced by this heavenly assenting chorus of numbers which no man can number. He brings his mind back to it upon all occasions. He calls it a "vast preponderance," a "boundless field" of belief, an "ever-repeated and jubilant affirmation," a "testimony vast, uniform and sacred." The doctrine of the Trinity has been "emphatically and gladly received, nearly always, everywhere and by all." It is therefore with great propriety that his respondents analyze this boasted majority, and find it to yield in the early centuries nothing that Dr. Huntington would now hold to deserve the name of Trinitarian, and, since the revival of theological speculation, every shade of diversified and inconsistent opinion which the established creed could suggest. If he can find the early Fathers to have been Trinitarian, then must he have been himself of that faith much longer than he supposes, while preaching amongst the Patristic believers who are arrayed in this discussion against him. Where was the need of charging them, as he does, with upholding their belief from "constitutional bias," from "influence of education," from "love of difference or innovation"? Has he not his comfort in going with the immense majority, and could it not have mellowed the slanderous charge upon his former friends to a tone of more charitable verisimilitude? Yet the lovers of pure truth have not been always so numerous, nor so free from persecutions, that a man should necessarily suppose them moved in faithful service to it by petty, private incitements. The Pharisees thus once, in an older time

of "new discussions," sure of their majority in the nation at large, pronounced their verdict against the truth-seeking minority, "This people that knoweth not the law is cursed." And it is, we may add, another curious example of the blinding power of a foregone conclusion, a want and desire of the feelings dragging on the lingering judgment, that when the Doctor sees in his majority enormous and irreconcilable divisions, he calls it "a substantial agreement amidst the large variety of forms and shades under which the doctrine has been theologically presented." The divisions and fierce fights thereon are "signs of the intense vitality and power hidden in the inmost spiritual economy of the article." The truth is, that he himself believes too much for his own majority. In our experience, we venture to affirm that the mass of believers is against him. Of the nine-tenths whom he claims as Trinitarian, six parts out of the nine are nondescript, and two, disguised Unitarian. It is an exceedingly small proportion that holds by the Doctor's opinion. Whatever men think upon the Trinity, Athanasianism as a living belief is fast declining.

Trinitarianism affords to the believer another comfort in its monotonous interpretation—the Doctor says harmonious—of all the Scripture books. It reads them all as one. He shall himself describe the advantage:

"Now the disciple, taking his stand on this immutable and far-reaching ground of interpretation, finds it a vantage-ground of incomparable superiority. The entire domain of scriptural revelation spreads itself out under a more luminous sun and a more hallowed air. Let literal criticism ply its needful and honourable labour as it will; let this and that other less broad explanation be adduced; let cavillers assent and deny because that is not demonstrated which the Spirit offers only to the reception of faith; nevertheless, once seen, the all-pervading and underlying Christian oneness of the sacred writings is inestimably impressive. They become a new creation to us; not a disjointed, dissevered, unequal, heterogeneous compilation; but, in the express design of God, a manifold and many-voiced affirmation of a single message. They are read in all their parts, even those remoter in subject from ourselves, with fresh enthusiasm. The poor presumption that proposes to set aside any member of the one sacred whole, comes to appear a flippant, superficial tampering of unholy hands with what God has joined together." (Sermons, p. 410.)

Immediately following is a misquotation: "The volume of the book is written of Him,"—a fair example of the usual character of this affected reverence for the whole, which carries the mind far above the miserable concern about the real written sense of any particular parts of Scripture. Of course the "we" and the "us" of the book of Genesis are brought in, no longer, it seems, as proofs, since scholars object—so much must be allowed to mundane learning—but as "illustrations" of the Trinity. They are "symbols to the believer. They appear at

a divine call." This is certainly an original way of splintering up a broken argument, the disabled of many wars. And here, if it be not presumptuous, one might wish to ask, upon what principles the new spiritual interpretation of the Bible is to be made? No portion of the canon is to be questioned, and all the admissible results of exegesis are foreseen and determined. What more can be done in this hopeless direction? We had certainly thought that the highest levels of sacred learning were only now becoming attainable; that the science of verbal and historic criticism was comparatively modern; that the way is opening to the purer light of a free yet devout and Christian interpretation generally alike of nature and of scripture. But the methods of antique ignorance are, it seems, the wisest,—clearly, we are happy to perceive, the only methods that will yield Trinitarian results. We can imagine with what a sense of sovereign and holy scorn Dr. Huntington must have read the able sermons of Mr. King and the various other critical comments upon his defective biblical learning. Perfect so far as they go, and altogether unanswerable in the light of the natural sense, which perceiveth not the things of the spirit, but poor beyond description he must consider them, who believes himself to see Christ's Deity in Scripture, "which was lying all the time plain and persuasive to the eye" before his conversion, "through a happier admission of God's grace." A much safer guide than criticism, if one could but be sure of securing it by a steady refusal to employ the more common gift of ordinary sense in reading the sacred books!

Now, to say nothing of the infinite contradictions of interpretation which have been put forth under this enormously conceited assumption of a miraculous gift which raises the soul above the mean fetters of sensible criticism, there are a few points we would gladly have settled. We are not about to enter upon the despised business of calmly examining the Scripture affirmations upon the true nature of God, Christ and the Holy Spirit, and the conditions and means of salvation; but we should like to ask that it may be once for all determined, at what point the revelation of the Trinity was first undoubtedly made? Is it or is it not a doctrine of inference? Did the spiritual Jews of the Old Testament or did they not believe it? When were the apostles first made acquainted with the doctrine? Or was it only left, as Olshausen is quoted by Dr. Huntington to say, "in germ," to be developed in post-apostolic times by the "scientific activity of the church"? For first of all they prove—Dr. Huntington does this—that Christ could not have revealed his divinity earlier than he did, if he ever did reveal it—for Olshausen implies the contrary—and then they affirm that it was disclosed in the "Elohim" and the "we" of Moses. And

in expounding his text, the parting commission of Christ to his disciples, the Professor declares that it contains

"— a decisive, explicit communication of the one essential, characteristic truth of His religion. The teaching church was then to be told what was to be taught. That central and sublime verity on which the whole matter of the gospel rested was to be condensed into a brief, comprehensive, significant sentence. . . . Now, if ever, Christ will distinctly proclaim the doctrine of Christendom. We listen with breathless anxiety to hear what Christianity means." (Sermons, p. 355.)

Amply have his opponents shewn that the Doctor is utterly at fault in finding here "the equal nature, dignity, duration, power and glory of three Persons in one God." We are only asking whether he means what he says, that now the revelation was for the first time fully and explicitly made. It would be a great point gained if we could but fix the Trinitarian world to any precise declaration upon the various matters of argument involved in the questions we have named; or if they would but say what would convert them from their present belief, or let us at once understand that reasoning and criticism are powerless against the sovereign law of the "needs of their spiritual nature," which must and will have a Trinity, whether it is in the Bible or not. It is an easy, but to our mind a most irreverent, escape from the difficulties of Scripture interpretation, to flit over it from passage to passage on inflated wings of spiritual ecstasy, persistently refusing to examine and compare its too real and plain statements. We may be wrong in our interpretation, but we are little likely to be amended by paradoxes of affected supernatural illumination.

What particular views of God and Christ Dr. Huntington happens to hold, interest us, we confess, but little. There is manifestly no principle or law of interpretation that could assist us or any persons to the same results. We only remark with painful satisfaction that he is sadly troubled and inconsistent on the matter of the three Persons. It is a comforting doctrine, it appears; and the comfort lies all in the personality of the Persons, and yet what view to take of them that does not lower the infinite Deity! He does not see that it is the whole business of his theology, its sole comforting peculiarity, to accomplish this very end of lowering the Divine Being to man's superstitious familiarity. It is so preached and praised in the vulgar ear, and so is it apprehended by the masses, who are delighted to find a God who is after all not God, but an abstract term, divisible into forms as easily as their own humanity. We do not therefore follow the preacher into his extravagances of speculation on the "eternal Son rooted in the Godhead," and even on earth retaining "the basis of his being unchanged, deific, uncreated," yet "condescending" to declare that he did not know what all the

time as the infinite God he knew perfectly; nor to conceive with him those "interior and permanent bases of their eternal being in which the Three are One, as three oceans" may be one great sea; nor to contemplate the three Personalities "issuing forth" from what seems to the profane eyes of one of his critics extremely to resemble the Brahm essence or quiescence of the Hindu mythologies; nor does it greatly concern us that he should interpret St. Paul to predict a coming period to the Trinitarian manifestation in the end, when the Son shall have given up the kingdom to the Father, and shall "resume his place in the co-equal Three," or be retaken into the One, and the distinctions of the Divine nature become lost to sight. It is all very strange. Only, as we cannot find anything of the kind in the Scriptures by any rational interpretation, we do not suppose that other persons will, excepting upon principles which might yield these or any other fancies—there can be no saying what—to the over-wrought and presumptuous imagination.

But there is another matter upon which we have yet to remark. It is the grand charge made against Unitarianism that it is the death of piety and of the life and zeal of the church. Is Dr. Huntington describing the American Unitarian churches? We trust and would fain believe that he is drawing upon his imagination. We do not recognize the likeness to anything with which we are acquainted in England. There is of course here and there a telling censure, and we would not lighten the force of the blow in any quarter where it may be deserved. But, for the most part, his facts are false, and for the rest we do not trust his judgment. We must offer a specimen. Let our Unitarian friends consider if there is anything amongst them to justify the description.

"The life dies out of both private and public devotion. Man's part of the business usurps the interest that belongs to God's part; the professed worshiper is more anxious to be enlightened or entertained or electrified by figures of rhetoric or bursts of declamation or ethical lecturing, than to be pardoned for his sins or to have his soul borne up in self-forgetful homage. Through a sentimental fear of charging God with severity, a cruel blow is struck at his equity, and his majestic attribute of mercy is construed to mean a fond indulgence of all sorts of people in all sorts of things. The very possibility of mercy or forgiveness is taken away, for where there is no penalty there is no clemency; indifference has nothing to forgive. A general infirmity creeps into religious action. A taste grows up for that sort of instruction which leaves all consciences equally at ease, substituting descriptions of a desirable goodness for the apostle's abrupt and searching rebuke, 'Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out;' or the Saviour's own, 'Except ye be converted ye shall all likewise perish.' . . . Missions are languid and unknown. Enthusiasm is chilled. . . . Discussions or diversions occupy the empty rooms of the prayer-meeting. The Sunday-school fails to supply its pupils with an answer to those that ask them what

they believe. ‘The world’ reaps an easy harvest. And of course where these tendencies predominate, the question whether anything which can properly be called a church of Christ will continue, is only a question of time.”—P. 401.

As might have been expected, the author does not fail to quote against us in this connection a certain series of reflections upon the Unitarian body which excited painful attention amongst us not very long since, as coming from one of such eminent abilities and of so high a position,—in which Ebionites, Arians and Socinians were made to “contrast unfavourably with their opponents,” and represented to “exhibit a type of thought and character far less worthy, on the whole, of the true genius of Christianity;” in which the Unitarian doctrine was described as “not distinctively Christian, but belonging also to Judaism, to Islam, and to simple Deism.” Unjust to the men and untrue to the facts, missing the real point of their whole protest against the delusions of orthodoxy, and misled by the mere conventional meaning of the name by which in history the Unitarian authors are known, that judgment was a mistake and a misfortune. It did not touch the points it aimed at, and therefore was without the smallest legitimate effect upon us in regard to any practical errors it was intended to correct. It seems hard that we should have to rebut such charges when used against us by writers of the school of Dr. Huntington, who in such phrases as those just quoted professes to supply our own Professor with reasons, in our want of the Trinitarian opulence of faith, for the defects which he so openly bewailed.

But we return to the point from which we started. These new considerations remind us once more that our chief fault is this, that we do not sufficiently abase humanity before God. For this was the one thing that really distinguished such men as Augustine and Pascal, Calvin and Wesley. Their theology begins from a depth lower than our convictions can ever carry us, and it is the want of this that constitutes the *gravamen* of all that Dr. Huntington affirms in our disparagement. He sees most clearly the connection of thought that binds the whole theory of Trinity to the atoning sacrifice of God the Son.

“It is as if the Father said, ‘All else has been done; I have created, guarded, guided, supported, blessed, forborne; Providence and revelation, in nature and in the inspired oracles of Moses and the prophets, have exhausted their possibilities. Lo! one mercy more; the last and mightiest. I can suffer for my children, I can come in the flesh, I can be one of them. In that incarnation I can ache and weep and sorrow for them and with them; all their stripes can be laid upon me; all their infirmities can cling to me. I can die as they die,—the last of the evils they dread, the penalty of the broken law. This shall both move and release them. This shall be the regeneration and the redemption of all mankind who will believe it.’ O infinite compassion! Hercin is love!

This is the ‘mystery hid from the foundation of the world’! The Holy Spirit ever comes, from the Father and the Son, to make the whole work effectual for the church and the heart. We behold, we begin at least to behold, why God is for ever ONE, is for ever THREE.”—P. 394.

Dr. Huntington rejoices in the phrase, “a dying God.” Anything short of this is not sufficiently orthodox for his need. Are we prepared to follow him? Or was there not one mercy yet, the necessary complement of all these, if all these had been true, that the scheme should have been less equivocally revealed—if it is revealed—in holy scripture; that some little condescension had been made to the intellect in its statement, so that Trinitarian Doctors should not for ever live in terror of criticism and learning and the increasing knowledge of mankind in the common ways and works of the Divine Father? As the question stands, the more men think, the less can they so conceive; the more they know, the less disposed are they to believe in any vindictive sovereignty in the Father which should have made the atonement necessary—the only thing that could—by any form of dying Deity. And if we are to make progress, as we earnestly desire, we cannot help trusting that it may be made in the contrary direction to that indicated in Dr. Huntington’s complaint of our defects. We shall learn from him to be on our guard against the contagion of orthodoxy, and strive to assure ourselves and others more strongly of the infinite love of Him who is our Creator not less truly than our Redeemer. This was Christ’s lesson, and we would rather receive from him the watchword of the warfare to which we are called with evils of thought no less than of word and deed. We have never, perhaps, so fully entered as we ought to have done into the great truth which is the essence of our Unitarian profession, nor carried out sufficiently to all its legitimate consequences our faith in the Fatherhood of the one, ever-living God. We have been hindered by orthodox prejudices, and by restraints of surrounding orthodox opinion. We are warned in the experience of Dr. Huntington to flee from this pest-stricken region of superstitious or fanatic terrors, to the true life and liberty of the trustful doctrine of Jesus, the doctrine of the infinite and universal Father. We conclude with the words of Dr. Dewey, from the beautiful and striking sermon with which the volume of replies is closed:

“Then, how does the sense of this love create, as the Scripture saith, a new heavens and a new earth, filling them with a presence, a life, a loveliness before unknown! Then, too, what unutterable argument is here for mutual love, for fidelity to every holy claim, for cheerfulness and courage and hope and aspiration immortal! Then how sounds in our ears that great word, God! We know, alas! what it was to the childhood of many of us,—so dull, so gloomy, so repulsive,—but now, signal and security for infinite joy! Then how is that blessed Being embosomed in infinite light, raying out ineffable splendours upon the universe around!”—P. 232.

THE PORT ROYALISTS.*

THE ecclesiastical historian whose one aim is to write truly and to do equal justice to all the actors who pass in review before him, sets himself a task of extraordinary difficulty. Even if he succeeds in curbing his own partialities and antipathies, he may fail to persuade his readers to a similar exercise of forbearance, and may, notwithstanding laborious research and literary skill, speak to an ungrateful and hostile age. His own scrupulous fairness may only irritate heated partizans, and he may find himself at last placed between the fire of two hostile armies. His only consolation under such circumstances is to make his appeal to another age, and to wait calmly for that reward which the prejudices of contemporaries deny him.

Mr. Beard has, we believe, approached his task in the right spirit, and has executed it with a fidelity as admirable as it is rare. The reception which his volumes may have will prove whether the mass of readers prefer history to fiction, and can appreciate the superiority of judicial wisdom to rhetorical advocacy. In entering a field of historical investigation on which the Church of Rome has been a combatant, he exposes himself to manifest danger. Could he have condescended to write for the frequenters of Exeter Hall or for the disciples of Ignatius, his reward from the one or the other would have been immediate, though transient. But he has dared to make his appeal to a higher order of moral sentiments, and to write a History which will be valued by those who are prepared to recognize goodness and nobleness wherever they exist, and whatever ecclesiastical name their possessors may wear. His purpose is well stated in one of the closing paragraphs of his work:

"It is now so well understood by thoughtful and candid men that the history of the Church is to be written with the same impartiality which we look for in all other history, that I make no apology for not having placed by the side of my Catholic tale a margin of Protestant comment. The ecclesiastical historian is not indeed exempt from the duty of moral judgment; nor have I refrained from pointing out the dangers of auricular confession when it was necessary to speak of casuistry, or from characterizing the essential error of monasticism when I had told the mournful story of Pascal's last years. But if a work like this is to be something better and more enduring than a party pamphlet, the historian must be able to see the facts which he narrates as they appear both from within and without the Church in which they manifest themselves. Few men may be qualified to write of a religious movement with which they have little intellectual sympathy; far fewer can speak honestly of one which engages their whole mind and heart. And the condition under which an impartial Church history is most

* Port Royal, a Contribution to the History of Religion and Literature in France. By Charles Beard, B.A. 2 vols. Post 8vo. Longmans, 1861.

likely to be produced is, that the writer should be able to put himself, by the force of moral fellow-feeling, in the place of those from whose intellectual conclusions he widely differs, yet whose character and action he endeavours to describe. It is not for me to judge how far I have succeeded in realizing my own ideal. It is the inevitable penalty of my position that my Protestant readers will think me too Catholic, my Catholic ones not Catholic enough. I shall be content if both acquit me of indifference to truth and right, wherever they may reveal themselves amid the shifting scenes of my story.”—II. 513, 514.

Whether or not the age is prepared for the work, we cannot doubt that Mr. Beard has in the History of Port Royal a truly noble subject, one full of incident, which brings before us a succession of picturesque and spirit-stirring groups, and concentrates our attention on some men and women richly gifted in intellect and still more distinguished by the “honest and good heart,” which is better than all the wisdom of the schools. Although the subject is not altogether new to the mere English reader, having been partially treated by Mrs. Schimmelpenninck, and eloquently but cursorily descanted on by the late Sir James Stephen, Mr. Beard’s work is the first complete and connected narrative of the story of the Port Royalists. He has availed himself of the labours of several predecessors, and especially of those of M. Ste Beuve, whose elaborate work, begun nearly a quarter of a century ago, was only completed last year. The History before us is not a mere compilation from previous histories, but is based on independent research, and is enriched by our author’s remarks, always acute and often original, on the characters and events developed in his story. In intellectual and moral portraiture, Mr. Beard shews himself especially happy. He paints boldly, but the lights and shades are thrown in with a discriminating eye and a gentle touch. On no part of his work have we dwelt with more pleasure or profit. “Arnauld’s long service of the truth; the simple-hearted but constant courage of his sisters and their nuns; the practical religious wisdom of St. Cyran and of Singlin; De Saçi’s daily walk with God; the all-sacrificing bravery of Le Maître and his companions in solitude; the kindly mysticism of Hamon; the self-constraining devotion of Pascal to all truth of thought and life; the modest conscientiousness of Tillemont’s studies; the apostolic energy of Pavillon’s labours;”—all these are characterized by our author with life-like vigour. In addition to these names, there appear on the canvas Cornelius Jansen, Racine, Boileau, and many others of lesser fame, but well entitled to a place in the literary and political history of France. Mr. Beard’s style is ornate, but not too rhetorical for the sobriety of history. When he does allow himself the indulgence of rhetoric, the reader’s judgment offers no resistance, but would in truth resent a colder treatment of the subject. The details given in the work (the two volumes contain nearly a thousand pages)

are abundant, and in many cases will prove entirely new to the majority of their readers. When we opened the volumes it was our purpose to devote an article to a general abstract of the History; but long before we reached its close, we knew that within our limits no abstract was possible. We must therefore select some of the salient points of the History, quote a few of the most characteristic passages, and then content ourselves with one or two brief remarks suggested by this very able contribution to religious history.

Port Royal was a Benedictine monastery in the vicinity of Versailles, the history of which goes as far back as the beginning of the thirteenth century. It was erected at the instance of a brave and enthusiastic knight, who on setting out to join the crusade desired to propitiate Heaven's favour and secure his own safe return by a work of pious charity. Mr. Beard judiciously leaves to mere antiquaries the early and intermediate history of Port Royal, fixing his attention on the last and most eventful century of its existence. It would be impossible for us to contract within a shorter compass the outlines of the story than as they are drawn by Mr. Beard in his first book, chap. iii.

"The story of Port Royal, as a source of religious life and literary activity in France, begins with the abbacy of Jacqueline Marie Arnauld, better known in the theological annals of the age as La Mère Angélique. Forced by considerations of domestic policy into the monastic life, and at first unwilling to undertake its obligations, she soon became impatient of their conventional fulfilment; and the strength of her character won its earliest triumph in imposing upon the nuns under her charge, the rigorous obedience to the Cistercian rule, which she was herself the first to practise. Nor was the triumph transitory. Her rare administrative powers perpetuated the reform which her stern conscientiousness had inaugurated; and to the last days of its conventional existence, poverty, seclusion, silence, rigid self-denial, and unsparing beneficence constituted the rule of life at Port Royal. The search for an adequate director of her conscience brought her into friendly intercourse with many of the most distinguished theologians of the day; while it is owing to her peculiarly intimate connection with St. Cyran, the friend and fellow-student of Jansen, that the history of Port Royal is the history of the Jansenist controversy. The whole power of the Society of Jesus leagued itself with the absolute authority of the French monarchy, to destroy an insignificant convent of Cistercian nuns, who, submitting themselves to the Holy See in every article of faith, refused to declare that five condemned propositions were contained in a book, which they had never read, and which was written in a language they did not understand. In defence of Port Royal, Arnauld and Nicole poured forth countless volumes of forgotten controversy, and Pascal wrote the one little volume of Provincial Letters, which never can be forgotten. To its sacred solitudes retired soldiers who wished to make their peace with heaven; statesmen upon whom the sun of court favour had ceased to shine; ladies whose waning charms reminded them of the obligations of piety; grandees, the monotony of whose grandeur palled upon their

power of enjoyment. It was here that Racine first learned the power of his pen; and when, in later life, the ascetic impressions of his youth at Port Royal returned, and he began to lament the profane successes of his muse, he drew hence the inspiration which glows in *Esther* and *Athalie*. While imprisoned in the Bastille, in the cause of Port Royal, De Saçi accomplished the translation of the Scriptures, which is still one of the monuments of the French tongue; and Tillemont, the historian of the Church, owed to the same source the direction given to his genius. In support of the persecuted monastery, the caustic wit of Boileau did not spare even Louis le Grand: and Madame de Sevigné gossips pleasantly on the holy peacefulness of its retreats. And the varied fortunes of the house, now saved by a miracle, and now by a pasquinade; protected now by the court influence of repentant duchesses, and now by the conspicuous virtues of saintly bishops; enlivened now by many gleams of the inextinguishable gaiety of France, and now attracting a deeper interest by the most patient fortitude, the most heroic truthfulness, the sublimest faith in duty and in God,—make up a story which illustrates, aptly enough, the heights of attainment and depths of degradation, of which human nature is capable.”—I. 22, 23.

How strangely to Protestant ears and minds sounds the story of Jacqueline Arnauld, not eleven years of age, being installed abbess of Port Royal! Two years previously she had taken the name of Angélique. There is nothing more remarkable in religious history than the revolution of mind and character through which La Mère Angélique (as she came to be called) passed. Not many women withdrawn from the world at seven years of age and soon after invested with almost irresponsible power, would have consented, as she did, to crucify the natural desires of the heart, to devote her life to all the painful observances of the strictest monastic rule, and with a vigorous hand put down all the abuses which she found in rank luxuriance in the monastery of Port Royal.

“Her quick vigorous intellect was mated with a keen conscience, and when once she had outgrown her childish thoughts and wishes, she boldly looked the necessities of her position in the face, and finding herself a nun, the affianced bride of Christ, and a person of authority in the Cistercian order, she resolved not only to perform faithfully her own religious duties, but to compel the nuns under her charge to observe the obligations laid upon them by their vows.”—I. 28.

In was in 1612 that Angélique found a confessor and a friend in St. Francis de Sales. Thus happily does Mr. Beard close a chapter devoted to the life and character of this able and very interesting son of the Church:

“Natural disposition, education, circumstance, co-operated to mould him into the champion of the Church in the hour of her need. His sweet temper, which made him the ideal of childish saintliness, was developed in after life into a suavity of disposition, a graciousness of demeanour, an equanimity of feeling and of speech, an insinuating kindness, which, while his friends compared it to the angelic mood, his

enemies accused of weakness and base compliance. But, joined to a perfect acquaintance with the points in debate between Catholics and Protestants, it was his chief weapon against heresy. ‘More flies are caught,’ he was wont to say, ‘with one spoonful of honey than with ten barrels of vinegar.’ He laid his episcopal dignity aside when the question was of converting a Calvinist: he patiently listened to the longest statement, and unravelled every difficulty; the ardour of his Italian nature lent pathos to his entreaties; the manifest holiness of his life added strength to his arguments. If any sneered at the pomp and wealth of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, he could truly declare that the Genevese Calvinists had left him no more than the necessities of life. If any accused the bishops of idleness and worldliness, his constant labours in preaching and catechising through his diocese were a sufficient reply. And another element of success was his undoubting faith in his own Church. He does not appear to have had an intellectual or a moral difficulty in connection with the Catholic system. His devotion to the Papacy, his respect for the bishops, was unbounded. He lived at a time when the Society of Jesus was concerned in more than one royal assassination in France, but his admiration of the Order never wavered. Whatever the Church approved was right; salvation was impossible beyond her pale; and it was, therefore, a work of love, to reconcile heretics and sinners to the great mother of souls. In this lies the secret of his life.

“It would hardly be unfair to take Francis de Sales as the type of modern Roman Catholic saintliness. Nor is his a character which it would be easy to parallel in a Protestant church. However sincere our admiration of his active and self-denying beneficence, we might be inclined to accuse his celibacy of asceticism, his humility of untruthfulness, his piety of mysticism, his obedience to the Church of servility. And yet, if these accusations be well founded, the fault lies not with the man, but with the system. By help of a happy nature, but also by dint of long labour and self-control, he raised himself to the height of the holiness which his Church enjoined, and which alone he recognised as holy. The character is symmetrical, but the symmetry resembles the result, not of growth, but of compression. It is the regularity of some metal tree, a masterpiece of the founder’s art, where all the branches observe due limits, and every leaf is in its place; not the free grace of a spreading beech, which has striven upwards to the light in its own way, and whose limbs have flung themselves abroad, as the rains and winds of heaven have been pleased to nourish or to fan them.”—I. 95, 96.

It was at a later period that Port Royal drew down upon itself the suspicion and charge of heresy and incipient Protestantism by its adoption of the doctrines propagated by Jansen respecting grace and predestination which he had drawn from the pages of Augustine. The consequence was the temporary prevalence among some of the sons and daughters of the Church of a theological system not very far removed from that which Calvin, by the force of his logic and his strong will, imposed on the Reformed Church. Although Jansen gave his name to a party and to the controversy which for a time convulsed the Church, the work on which his theological fame rested, the

“Augustinus,” or “The Doctrine of St. Augustine touching the Health, Sickness and Remedy of Human Nature,” was posthumous, having been commended on his death-bed in 1638 to the care of his friends. It made its appearance in 1640, and roused among all sections of the Church a sensation similar in kind (but far more intense in degree) to that which the Essays and Reviews of the Oxford latitudinarians are now making on Churchmen in England. After years of angry controversy, the then Pope (Innocent X.) was obliged to submit to a special congregation composed of cardinals and assessors five heretical propositions which the opponents of the Jansenists imputed to them. For eight weary months in 1652 and 1653, the congregation discussed all the intricate metaphysical speculations growing out of the five propositions, and the issue was that a Papal bull condemning the propositions was launched against the Jansenists on Whit-Sunday, 1653. On the vexed question whether the five propositions are really to be found in the *Augustinus* of Jansen, Mr. Beard gives this judgment:

“The Five Propositions are, I think, to be inferred from various passages of the ‘*Augustinus*,’ without unlawful torturing of the words or the sense. But, on the other hand, the Propositions, in the form in which they were condemned, by no means express the doctrine of Jansen. Even the first, which appears to be a verbal quotation from him, is, say the Jansenists, greatly modified by what precedes and follows. And to judge of so vast and elaborate a result of thought by five detached sentences, is a proceeding to be paralleled only by that of the old Greek blockhead who carried a brick in his pocket as a sample of his house.”
I. 260.

We must not dwell on the history and wrongs of St. Cyran, the friend and disciple of Jansen. We had marked for quotation Mr. Beard’s admirably clear and discriminating portrait of him (I. 175—178), but must pass on without it. The mantle of St. Cyran fell on his chosen disciple, Antoine Arnauld, brother of Angélique, who in his course at the Sorbonne, before Jansen’s book appeared, propounded and defended the doctrine of grace, which the Church afterwards branded as heretical, and for defending which Arnauld had to endure a half-century of toil, struggle and suffering.

No greater name is inscribed in the annals of Port Royal, none in the history of the religious literature of France, than Blaise Pascal. No part of Mr. Beard’s work bears clearer tokens of wide research, of independent and ingenious thought, and, we may add, of deep interest in his subject, than the first portion of his second volume, which is devoted to the life, writings and character of this wonderful man. We shall not detain our readers with any sketch of a life, the leading incidents of which must be familiar to every student. We shall more profitably occupy our space by describing the results at which our author has

arrived when contemplating those portions of the life of Pascal around which there has been obscurity or controversy. Pascal's mind had been from the earliest period impressed by his father (Etienne Pascal) with a feeling of reverence for religion. He had imbibed the conviction that the objects of faith are not those of reason, and cannot be subject to it. His mind, fearless in philosophy, had a child-like submissiveness in matters of religion. A serious accident which befel his father when Pascal was in his twenty-fourth year, introduced him to the society and friendship of two men, M. de la Bouteillerie and M. des Landes, who, practising surgery, used their opportunities of confidential intercourse to diffuse the Jansenist principles of Port Royal which they had learnt from the curé of Rouville.

Blaise Pascal was the first of the family to feel the new religious impulse communicated to them all by these spiritual physicians. He presently withdrew from some of the studies in the pursuit of which he had already achieved a reputation out of proportion to his years, and gave the whole energies of his mind and heart to religious thoughts and duties. There came, indeed, a temporary cloud over his soul, and before his final and complete conversion there was a period of worldliness and vanity. During his residence in Paris, whither he went in 1647 at the bidding of physicians (for his health had already fallen prostrate before disease), he felt the passion of love, the object of which is supposed to have been a lady of rank, the sister of the Duc de Roannez, his own intimate friend. His passion was not crowned with success. She whom he is supposed to have loved, after vainly attempting to find an asylum from mental misery in Port Royal, married a younger son of a noble house and lived a life of disappointment, and became at length the victim of disease which terminated her wretched existence. Some of the biographers of Pascal have ascribed to him, during his temporary revolt from the influences of an ascetic religion, actual and gross vice. Mr. Beard entirely discredits this, adding the just remark, that "an Augustinian theology makes another and a darker estimate of conduct than a philosophical morality; and, inverting the old maxim, supposes the greatest saint to have been the greatest sinner. The theory of monasticism works in the same direction, and mistrusts the purity of any life, the ardour of any devotion, which do not assume its forms and own its restraints." The ardour of his religious feelings was renewed by the impression made on his mind by two incidents: one, the dangerous illness of his sister, the gifted Jacqueline Pascal; the other, his own remarkable preservation from destruction when the leading horses of a carriage in which he was were precipitated into the river from the Pont de Neuilly, while the carriage and himself were preserved by the breaking of the traces. He then abandoned the world and its vanities, and at the close of 1654 retired

to Port Royal des Champs. There “the new solitary threw all the ardour of his nature into his self-mortification, so that before long Jacqueline wrote to remind him that neglect of personal cleanliness is not a necessary accompaniment of perfect holiness.” In his narrative of the influences which led Pascal to renounce the world, and in his reference to the preternatural visions which he is said to have received, Mr. Beard is of course largely influenced by the theory of spiritual influence which he and others have accepted from his instructor in religious philosophy,—a theory as profoundly mystical as anything ever taught by Wesley or the masters of the Sorbonne. The philosophy which reconciles the mind to the theory of a *preternatural* vision, as aiding the final conversion of Pascal, might, it seems to us, as easily include within its faith the miracle of the “holy thorn,” or any other strongly-attested Romish marvel. But we have little disposition to dwell on matters in which we dissent from our author’s views.

Thus eloquently does Mr. Beard describe the self-denying mortifications, corporeal and intellectual, of which Pascal voluntarily made himself the victim :

“Hardly in the prime of life, and yet at the very point of death; with intellectual powers capable of any achievement, yet crippled by unremitting bodily torment; exorcising doubt by arguments which lend a majesty to ecclesiastical authority, and yet rebelling against the Church, to fulfil a higher allegiance to truth; with a heart made for love, and household angels, such as fall to few men’s share, turning his back upon all affections but the holiest, and in comparison with that, heaping fierce depreciation upon every other; spying a danger to purity in a child’s caress, and paganism in faithful wedlock; having fled from the world to avoid temptation, yet needing the help of a spiked girdle to overcome it—what ideal is this of the Christian life? We are not allowed to find the key to the mystery in Pascal’s infirmities, which prevented the devotion to theological, of the powers which he had withdrawn from scientific study. ‘Sickness,’ he said in his last illness, ‘is the Christian’s natural state; for it places us in the condition in which we ought always to be; suffering evil, deprived of all the goods and all the pleasures of sense, exempt from all the passions which are busy during the whole course of life; without ambition, without avarice; in the constant expectation of death. Is it not thus that Christians ought to pass life?’ And yet, what would become of the world, if all Christians did thus pass their lives?

“To what a height of moral grandeur does not this last struggle after perfectness raise itself? We lose sight at first of all but the divine strength of will, the ardour and constancy of self-sacrifice, the upward rush of aspiration, which enable a human life so to deprive itself of all earthly delights, that it may find its single, all-sufficient delight in God. In Pascal, at least, there is no reason to doubt the purity of the motive; no wild remorse for a profligacy as wild, drove him to solitude and self-maceration; no popular renown for sanctity rewarded his past, or spurred him to fresh austerity. His mode of life was deliberately adopted as

that which alone became a Christian man ; and its very obscurity was a necessary constituent of its worth. And men to whom virtue comes in winning guise, and brings her own charms with her in home pleasures, and innocent recreations of art and literature and society, wonder, not without awe, at the fortitude which cuts away all these things from life, as possible occasions of sin, and is content to live and die, deprived of every gift of God, save the gift of Himself. So, not seldom, we are blinded to the real proportion of things ; as the crag that rises riven and bare in one clear sweep from our feet, impresses us with its height more than the loftier hill which swells gently from the plain, and is corn-covered to the top. Is then the ascetic's life the hardest ? Not so thought St. Cyran, when he doubted whether even D'Andilly could make his peace with God in the world ; he would have his friend fly to the desert, as the less arduous post in life's battle. To live a holy life by shunning temptation, and by conquering it, are not the same thing ; and this, the Protestant, not that, the Catholic ideal is the noblest."—II. 78, 79.

On the subject of the monastic theory, which is sometimes found to taint even Protestant ideas, we must further quote a passage, admirable alike in thought and expression :

" It is a theory which, by concentrating the undivided attention of the soul upon the conditions of existence in another life, makes it deaf to the demands of love and duty in this. The question which its votary asks himself is not, How can I best fill my place *here*? but, In what way shall I most certainly insure my safety *there*? So, as it is part of the world's moral constitution, that opportunities of duty should be also possible occasions of sin ; that there should be a point at which innocent enjoyments cease to be innocent, and domestic affections traverse the course of a higher duty ; this theory bids men apply themselves to win heaven, by evading the problem of earth : and for very dread of sin, to turn their backs upon the possibility of virtue. I say nothing of the inherent selfishness of such a view of life ; of the way in which it turns inward upon himself, and his spiritual state, all a man's thought and striving, and roots up the faculty of unconscious affection, and natural enjoyment. One thought sufficiently condemns it ; that the highest type of human life cannot be such as, realised in all men, would make the world a howling wilderness. It seems to me that Pascal, feeling the love of God on his life in the love of wife and children ; pressing on with swift step into the mysteries of the physical universe ; striving too (there is nothing inconsistent in the double task) to strengthen the defences of revealed religion, and presenting the example of one more faithful and God-fearing life to the foul licence of court and city, might have learned secrets of Divine wisdom and human possibility, of which the recluse of Port Royal, the haunter of Parisian churches, must have remained ignorant."—II. 80, 81.

It was during his Port Royal life—indeed, within thirteen months of his entrance—that Pascal wrote the work which has immortalized his name, and by which, it has been truly remarked, he did more to ruin the name of Jesuit than all the controversies of Protestantism or all the fulminations of the Parliament of

Paris. The occasion of the publication of the "Provincial Letters" was this. In the year following Pascal's renunciation of the world, Antoine Arnauld denied the existence in the writings of Jansenius of the propositions condemned by the Pope. This flying in the face of the highest ecclesiastical authority provoked the wrath of the Sorbonne, and they proceeded to cut off this heretical member of their body by excluding him from the faculty of theology. Assuming the pseudonym of Louis de Montalte, he poured forth a series of letters, designed not only to defend his friend, but to cover his persecutors with contempt. Mr. Hallam's condensed statement gives us a good description of the Provincial Letters: "In the first four of them he discusses the thorny problems of Jansenism, aiming chiefly to shew that St. Thomas Aquinas had maintained the same doctrine on efficacious grace, which his disciples the Dominicans now rejected from another quarter. But he passed from hence to a theme more generally intelligible and interesting, the false morality of the Jesuit casuists. He has accumulated so long a list of scandalous decisions, and dwelled upon them with so much wit and spirit, and yet with so serious a severity, that the order of Loyola became a by-word with mankind."

Never was a more decisive or rapid victory won than by the author of the Provincial Letters. The men whose intolerance and false morality he exposed to the scorn of the world had scarcely a word to say in self-defence. From the charge, sometimes brought against Pascal, that he set a bad example in the employment of raillery in matters of religion, this is Mr. Beard's sufficient defence:

"It is not true that Pascal was the first to employ wit and humour in religious controversies. Men to whom God has given wit and humour have always employed those faculties in whatever controversies they have conducted. The only question open to discussion is whether Pascal used his powers rightly; whether he laughed at what was venerable or directed the shafts of his sarcasm at what was holy and true. And he is free from blame, if, as I believe, the whole force of his genius was employed against the unholy and the untrue; if his book lifted a veil from the consciences of men, and enabled them to see clearly the boundaries of right and wrong, which the casuists had subtly sought to hide."

I. 290.

How little our author assents to Mr. Hallam's dictum that the Provincial Letters cannot now be read with much interest or pleasure, the following remarks will shew:

"For the perfection of Pascal's style—I had almost said for the perfection of prose composition—we must go to the 'Provincial Letters.' At first the reader forgets to notice the style, so natural, so complete is its presentation of the author's thought; as sometimes the distant hills stand out so clearly as to encourage the belief that no atmospheric medium floats between. Some happy turn of phrase, some subtle touch

of irony reveals the hand of a master; and he begins to discover that every sentence possesses the polish, and many the point of an epigram. Yet the point is in the matter, not merely in the words; the phrases are not padded to fill out the limb of an antithesis; each fully expresses its thought and no more. But every thought is expressed in a way which defies amendment; a word more or less is felt to destroy the fine harmony and proportion of the whole. The naturalness of the dialogue, the keenness of the wit, the grave and quiet irony, the Socratic art with which the inquirer compels his various interlocutors to speak as serves his purpose, would be alone sufficient to account for the fame of the book. In them speaks the Pascal of the salons of Paris; the Pascal of Port Royal utters himself in the sublime moral vehemence, the eloquent invective, of the later letters. The gay mockery of the debate on sufficient and efficacious grace, seems to proceed from other lips than those which denounce the calumniators of Port Royal."—II. 121, 122.

The only revenge and comfort left to the Jesuits was slanderingously to declare that in his last hours Pascal regretted having written the Provincial Letters. The fact was, that about a twelvemonth before his death he said, so far from repenting, had he to do the work again, he would make it stronger.

The other work of Pascal, the "Thoughts," which almost rivals the fame of the Provincial Letters, has only recently, through the labours of M. Cousin, been presented to the public in a genuine form. It has been clearly proved by comparison with the original MSS., chiefly in Pascal's autograph, that the early editions abounded in suppressions and interpolations. The consequence, however, of the alteration and purification of the text of this very remarkable book (which is now, we suspect, much more frequently read than the Provincial Letters) is the fastening on the author the suspicion of scepticism. Mr. Beard decides that Pascal must be ranked in the sceptical school of philosophy :

"The scepticism, if it is there at all, leavens the whole book; is involved in the assumptions from which it starts, and the methods by which it proceeds; lurks in the conclusions to which it arrives. It may be wholly or in part unconscious; believing men often write and say, what to other minds appears to contain the very essence of disbelief. And without wishing to adopt the words in which M. Cousin states his case, or to take a side in the debates to which that statement has given rise, I am compelled to believe, that in regard to all philosophical truth, Pascal was as much a sceptic as his favourite teacher Montaigne.

"Montaigne rested quietly in his philosophical doubt; Pascal, with marvellous mental dexterity, built his edifice of religious faith upon its uncertain foundation. And thus he was not a sceptic, if we use the word in its common English meaning. It is impossible to doubt the almost fanatical sincerity of his religious belief. Religion appeared to his conscience to ask the sacrifice of all that had hitherto made the brightness of his life; his intercourse with the world, his domestic affections, his mathematical and physical studies, the comforts which alone could prolong and make endurable his frail and painful existence; and the

sacrifice was unhesitatingly offered. He ranged himself from the first upon the side of a persecuted minority of the Church, and devoted his wonderful powers to its defence with such eagerness and persistence, as to overrun the zeal of the great captains who had enlisted him in the service. There is no proof that he betook himself to the Church as the one refuge open to him from the torments of doubt; or that by any effort of will, he compelled a mind, which would otherwise have wandered through boundless fields of speculation, to rest uneasily beneath the shadow of authority. His faith was clear, calm, undoubting; his book is not so much the record of any personal struggles through which he had himself arrived at Christian belief, as the exhibition of what he considers the best way of dealing with atheists. He finds that his keen mathematical intellect can detect flaws in the ordinary evidences of religion. He sees that those evidences are not logically accordant with the doctrine which shapes his theory of Christianity. And therefore he resolves to accept the conclusions of the sceptics up to a certain point, and yet to deduce from them the doctrines of Roman Catholicism. Other men need a rock upon which to build their lighthouse; he will erect his beacon upon the quicksands, or the heaving waves themselves; they attach their argument to the assumption of faith in human faculties; he will chain his reasoning to the confession of their incapacity. The doctrine is sceptical enough; but the teacher, if we look only to his personal belief, no sceptic."—II. 118, 119.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

NATURE AND GOD.

SIR,

IN trying to answer briefly the few comments kindly proffered by your correspondent "J." I fear lest I need shelter myself under that old adage, "Brevis esse laboro, obscurus fio." I think I might fairly enough ensure simple brevity by a respectful demurrer against a reiteration of a "*petitio principii*" as well as a *non sequitur*, like those already questioned. But as I aim not at disputation (*Socratic* or other), but at divine truth, I will, with your permission, indicate what I think and feel.

Neither "J." nor I need assure each other nor yourself, Sir, that such a topic, duly treated, is as immense as its devotional influences are intense. Anxious to keep the subject as *impersonal* as possible, I beg to say that I regard not "the National Reviewer as singular in holding or first in enunciating" the doctrine in question; nor do I hold its issues to be of moment as being in the National or any other Review, but as regarded purely and simply *in se*.

Admitting freely that not only in the name of Grotius, but of many other writers commanding respect, all propositions laid down and all positions taken up may in some sense be "of authority," yet I would remind "J." that such allegations have but the weight of what falls

from *uninspired* man, and that, even if they be attributed to miraculously-inspired persons, they are not on that account beyond reverent free inquiry.

To guard my position against imputation of subserviency to any oracular *dicta*, I not only refuse homage to Grotius and all his most estimable compeers, but even abstain from those quotations of HOLY WRIT which I cannot forget or regard little. I avoid the textual and biblical treatment, because at all times, and specially in sceptical times, such a course leads to no satisfactory conclusion.

Of your charity, bear with me, Sir, while I utter the opinion that Unitarians, both lay and divine, have hitherto been very prone to place their doctrinal cause in a jeopardy not necessarily nor properly incidental to their leading article of faith.

Surely it seems a narrow and an unphilosophical view, fast becoming obsolete amongst believers in God who are alike liberal and devout, that because He makes $2 + 2 = 4$ to us little numerical mortals, therefore His own arithmetic must be similar to ours, or that the Great Spirit must be (let us say it with awe) an arithmetician at all. To my mind there appears nothing (at least in this scientific age) that more tends to mere *Anthropomorphism* than the ascription of what we designate as *numerical* faculties, or *mathematical* abilities, or *metaphysical* habits of reflection and decision, or *SCIENTIFIC (?)* properties and functions, unto Him by whose *fiat* light was and "*KOSMOS*" is. Almost as well—nay, perhaps better—might the infusory animalcule be supposed to think that MAN has *its* tiny elements of being, sense and action, as for man to deem his technical tables of knowledge and research to be telegrams and photographs from the *data* and designs of God.

Let us rather in all devout humility hold that, neither in arithmetic nor in geometry, nor in any other of those things which we call *science*, are His ways our ways, His thoughts our thoughts. Oh! if we would embrace *kosmical* (*cosmonomical?*) views of Nature and of God, surely we must ever beware of believing or imagining that earthly scope of most advanced astronomy can be or teach the universal ken of God.

Your correspondent "J." calls my attention to a consequence of my views, which "to us as Unitarians (he thinks) is of greater practical moment."

Now I fear "J." will set me down as a very rash, cold or crazy *Unitarian*, when I avow that, even though such results did attend upon such a position as mine, I should not bate one jot of heart or hope concerning God's truth as it is in Jesus, and as it is in Nature likewise. But I claim for my views an effect precisely the reverse of that which "J." apprehends; and all the more so, too, because study and debate upon this and cognate doctrines have thoroughly persuaded me that "the *numerical* argument so often triumphantly urged by Unitarian divines against the doctrine of the Trinity," is, in the present large and free development of theological research, becoming almost or altogether untenable.

THE (Athanasian) TRINITY, how critically and charitably soever explained away by some advocates, I never can read or hear without horror and hatred (*pace suâ loquar*), as having had its hollow hint from hell. But that Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are ONE with the Father, I hold to be true as holiest hopes of heaven. But then I believe that you,

Sir, and "J." and I may, through the favour of God and the guidance of the Christ, enter also into *that ONENESS*. And in *such unity* I see not only trinity but PLURIMITY. Again, this unity is not personal nor intellectual, but moral and spiritual. Nor can I view the Great Spirit, "the God over all," in any such other unity as can be calculated by common arithmetic or pure mathematics, or any scientific process whatsoever known to man. And I hold it essential to believe the one God of Nature and the one God of Scripture to be one and THE SAME God. I mark this emphatically, because there appears from time to time, even amongst *Christian UNITARIANS*, a tendency to treat the awful questions of Deity and Providence as if there were one God of Nature and one God of Scripture, one to be scanned philosophically, one to be regarded spiritually; and as if these two Gods were not two gods, but *each only ANOTHER, yet the same*.

And so, again, whilst Unitarians, with other Protestants, are most reasonably and devoutly shocked at the Romish titular affix, "MOTHER of God," one cannot help occasionally shuddering almost as much when one reads and hears from eloquent minds expressions and arguments which uphold "NATURE" and HER "Laws," as if SHE were Governess or Lady-superior of our God.

Here many dark and difficult and boundless themes and theories suggest themselves, as free-will, necessity, fate, &c. Into these I enter not now farther than by way of brief reply to the courteous queries of "J." When I was "under tutors and governors," I stoutly and sternly held fast the philosophical doctrine of necessity, and for long years hugged it to my heart as tightly as it had been fastened in my head. After much mental wrestling, I arrived, some few years back, at the opposite conclusion respecting human conditions of motive and self-governance and liability. I am thus egotistical, because nothing has done more than this change of opinion to bring me to my present sense of the absolutely and perfectly *unconditioned* being of our God. What! having cast what appears to me the *slough* of the tight old doctrine of necessity off from my own shoulders, shall I fling it or let it fall (even in philosophic fancy) upon the finger of God? I shrink from imputing to my God that He is in any sort or sense subject, liable, barred or bounded. Far too technical, mechanical, *engineering-like*, are the terms and epithets lavished upon Him whose whole work is the effective word of His "*unconditioned*" will.

In my view, the only thing impossible with God is, at once to BE and not be. But this is an abstract truism. It is to say, that *He who ever is can never NOT be*; or, *He who is ALWAYS can nowise be NEVER*.

February 7, 1861.

N. K. N.

[It is desirable that this discussion should end here.—ED. C.R.]

PHYSICAL PECULIARITIES OF THE ANCIENT HEBREWS.

SIR,

THE observations of Mr. Barnard Davis (C. R. for January last) have recalled to my mind a remark which I made nearly fifty years ago in commenting on the history of David. According to the description of

him in 1 Samuel xvi. 12, 18, he had the characteristics of *the sanguine temperament*, as it is called by physiologists. "He was ruddy, and withal of a beautiful countenance, and goodly to look to." He appears to have differed from his elder brothers in having that kind of beauty which consists chiefly in the expression of kind affections, lively feelings, a fine imagination and a penetrating intellect. His natural quick and lively temperament may in some measure explain his subsequent conduct; but the description entirely differs from our common conception of a Jew, and agrees with Sir Gardner Wilkinson's account of the Jews of Egypt, as quoted by Mr. Davis.

Highgate, Feb. 9, 1861.

JAMES YATES.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

SIR,

THE very satisfactory Report, printed in your last No., of our College does not contain any reference to a matter on which all will agree there is a deficiency. According to the existing College curriculum, no provision is made for teaching the young men who are to be our future ministers the principles of Political Economy. It was not so at York and Glasgow, where many now usefully fulfilling ministerial duty among us were educated. There is in these days of new theories of philanthropic action, especial need that our future instructors should be themselves taught what is possible, what otherwise, what is safe and what is dangerous in practice. *Socialism* in some of its aspects is to the young and inexperienced somewhat attractive. The only cure that I know of is a good course of instruction in Political Philosophy. Such a course could be given by either of the accomplished and excellent Professors who preside over our College. I know of more than one instance in which the want of such instruction has diminished the usefulness of young ministers who not long ago were pupils at the College. Let not the plea of want of time prevent an immediate remedy. The cessation of some of the more profound metaphysical studies, which, in the opinion of some friends of the College, occupy a disproportionately large space in the curriculum, would make ample room for a course of lectures on Political Economy.

London, Feb. 12, 1861.

E. G. A.

WHAT ATHENS HAS DONE FOR THE WORLD'S LITERATURE.

FROM hence have sprung, directly or indirectly, all the noblest creations of the human intellect; from hence were the vast accomplishments and the brilliant fancy of Cicero; the withering fire of Juvenal; the plastic imagination of Dante; the humour of Cervantes; the comprehension of Bacon; the wit of Butler; the supreme and universal excellence of Shakspeare. All the triumphs of truth and genius over prejudice and power, in every country and in every age, have been the triumphs of Athens.—*Lord Macaulay.*

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Disquisitions and Notes on the Gospels. Matthew. By John H. Morison. Boston—Walker, Wise and Co. 1860.

Life of Jesus: a Manual for Academic Study, by Dr. Carl Hase, Professor of Theology in the University of Jena. Translated from the German of the Third and Fourth Improved Editions, by James Freeman Clarke. Boston—Walker, Wise and Co. 1860.

HERE are new signs of the theological diligence of our Transatlantic ministers, bespeaking also the acceptableness of their books to a wider circle of readers than we fancy the same books would find among us.

Mr. Morison's volume on Matthew is intended to be followed by another on the three remaining Gospels; and he also informs us in his Preface that a volume on the rest of the New Testament Scriptures is in preparation by Dr. A. P. Peabody as part of the same series. He adopts Tischendorf's text in all variations of importance. The book is on a somewhat fuller scale than Livermore's Commentary, to which he makes respectful allusion, wishing he could be sure of having made as faithful and intelligent a use of materials now accessible to scholars as Mr. L. did twenty years ago. In addition to the usual plan of text and foot-notes, he prefixes to each section of the Gospel history a variety of disquisitions and religious and moral comments on its respective contents.

The translator of Hase's *Life of Jesus* is already well known to English Unitarians. He describes the work as "uniting decision with impartiality, and moderation of opinion with entire freedom," and as "avoiding extremes without trying to avoid them." Its result, he says, "is neither the conclusion of Strauss nor that of Hengstenberg." Hase, "as a philosopher, accepts miracles, accounting them necessary to the Divine moral government of free moral agents. As an historian, he receives as fact the miraculous phenomena attending the course of Jesus. But as a critic, he examines every particular miracle by itself, and while admitting most of them as real supernatural phenomena, rejects some on account of insufficient evidence." (Pref. pp. iii, iv.) After reading the book carefully through, we should express our estimate of its theological position somewhat differently. The rationalizing spirit seems to us excessive, for one who admits miracles as philosophically credible and historically true; and the frequently suggested solution by "magnetic clairvoyance" and "sympathetic clairvoyance," looks to us like the utter credulity of sceptical criticism. Christ's knowledge of the Samaritan woman's history "has an analogy in magnetic clairvoyance"! (p. 113). And (p. 134), "The demons were considered to possess superior knowledge, and it might actually occur in certain cases, that a diseased person, *by sympathetic clairvoyance*, might discover him to be the Messiah out of his own consciousness"! There are some curious speculations on "the mysterious proximity of life and death" in reference to the raising of Lazarus (p. 184), which the simple belief in miracle might well have spared. And on the miracles of Jesus in general we read the following wild speculations:

"The raising of the dead may indeed be explained by the Old Testament types, and by misunderstandings of the Messianic work, as having originated

in the belief of the Church. But the manner in which they are related, and the mysterious proximity of death and life so long as the organs of life are not absolutely destroyed and the body not decayed, give reason for regarding them only as the highest manifestations of the miracle of healing. Perhaps all cures are confined to the region where the power of will over the body exists, which is often noticed in single cases and in less degree. These cures therefore are not without analogies in all ages and times. A resemblance is afforded us in animal magnetism, only so far as it contains a mysterious power over disease, arising out of the great life of nature; and perhaps, moreover, the means which Jesus used may have stood in some relation to magnetic phenomena. But the miraculous power of Jesus appears far more like intelligent mastery of nature by the soul. The soul of man, originally endowed with dominion over the earth, recovered its old rights by the holy innocence of Jesus conquering the unnatural power of disease and death," &c.—P. 98.

We confess we can neither realize the theory suggested, nor appreciate its value to a believer in miracles. Perhaps a German critic is bound to be, or at least to seem, always ingenious, and to ticket every incident, natural or miraculous, with its precise constituent elements, real or imaginary. We are agreeably surprised, after these wild speculations (in connection with which we may name the author's opinion at p. 100, "that insanity in general results from sin"), to find a more sober tone of criticism adopted in reference to the death and resurrection of Jesus. An extract or two may interest those of our readers who remember the earnest discussion on these subjects lately conducted in our pages; and the conclusions of this German writer will seem the more important when taken in connection with his disposition to magnetism, clairvoyance and other *natural* explanations. Alluding to the notion of Woolston, Strauss and others, that each apostle imagined he saw Jesus present in visions, he says:

"But in order to give probability to this view, we must assume the strangest misunderstandings and suppose visions to be poetized into proofs of material existence at Jerusalem. This would be more like falsehoods than myths. But we must, in such a case, moreover, suppose a power of faith of a nature hitherto unknown to be produced out of utter despair. An immeasurable effect is thus ascribed to the most insignificant cause, and a revolution in the history of the world is supposed to have come from an accidental self-deception. Therefore those who adopt this view are, moreover, obliged to suppose that Jesus, after his death, had, by means of some magical and miraculous power, assured those who believed in him of his actual existence, and in this way produced these strong convictions. (Weisse.) The historical basis for such a view consists in the fact that Paul places his own inward experiences with the risen Jesus on the same plane as the outward manifestations made to the other disciples. Paul was inclined to this way of looking at the subject by his personal wishes. He was also justified in doing it, since the catastrophe of his own life was the personal but inward [?] appearance to him of Jesus Christ. Yet his faith in the resurrection of Jesus was not derived from these experiences of his own; for the disciple of Gamaliel could not have considered the ascent of a soul out of Hades to be equivalent to a resurrection. Any merely spiritual appearances, necessarily a matter of purely subjective perception, must immediately sink to the rank of mental visions. These would leave only an uncertain and uneasy impression, and never create such a great moral enthusiasm. Whatever may be said of the historic contents of the first chapter of Acts, it cannot be denied that the early establishment of the church at Jerusalem was based on faith in the risen Messiah, who, unless he arose from the dead, would be nothing but a disgraced corpse. Hence the truth of the

resurrection stands immovably based upon the testimony, and we may even say upon the very existence, of the apostolic church itself.”—Pp. 233, 234.

From the next section, “The Life of the Risen One,” we quote some remarks singularly apposite to the questions debated by our own correspondents.

“In these accounts of the risen Master a twofold tendency appears. First, to represent him as manifesting himself in a strange and ghost-like way. The other, to consider him as possessing his former human body. To reconcile these views, some have supposed that it was a glorified body and not the same earthly one. If anything distinct is intended by this, the process of decay must have been changed into a sudden obliteration of the earthly element. But in this case, it would be a mere illusion that Jesus ate food and was actually touched. The resurrection and ascension are not the same event, either in the view of the fourth evangelist or as a matter of fact. For in that case the appearance of Jesus after the resurrection would be that of a ghost (Weisse), or we must else accept a series of ascensions (Kinkel). The view of Rothe (Theolog. Ethik.) that ‘death, resurrection and ascension fall in the same moment, as the incarnation of the indwelling God,’ involves a repeated resumption of the body for the purpose of shewing himself to his disciples. Something magical appears in this manifestation of a dead and decaying body as one alive with the marks of its wounds. This view is also opposed to Luke xxiv. 39, and is borrowed from Gnosticism.”—P. 234.

The critic reverently leaves the *how* of the Ascension in the obscurity which the Gospels themselves have failed to clear up. Except in the cases of Mark and Luke, “silence prevails in the other apostolic writings. They take for granted that Jesus is in heaven; but a bodily ascension does not belong to the contents of the first Christian creed. . . We need not infer the necessity of a visible resurrection” (p. 239). “His departure was not the sad departure of a mortal, but the blessing of a glorified being, who, being one with the Godhead through his love, promised also to remain an undying presence with his friends. And he has thus remained with us.”

Yet our German has an ingenious after-thought, which he adds in a note ending thus: “We need not deny the historic ascension when we receive the ideal and universal view of it. The critic may remember that the ascent of an earthly body into the air is not an incredible event, so long as there are such creatures as birds in existence?” What does this mean? Does the anatomical structure of birds suggest an *ideal and universal view* of Christ’s *historic ascension*? We confess we cannot understand the suggestion.

Health, Husbandry and Handicraft. By Harriet Martineau. Post 8vo.
Pp. 583. London—Bradbury and Evans.

THIS volume is a collection of essays, which have appeared in several of our popular periodicals, from the pen of one of our most gifted writers, one whom we rejoice to meet in every field save that of *theology*. They who read in “Once a Week” the series of papers on sanitary matters, so full of vigorous sense clothed in the purest English, will be pleased to find them collected under the first head of this book, with its triple and alliterative title. The “Farm of Two Acres,” which introduces the Husbandry department of the work, is, like the other “Farm of Four Acres” about which we have read, regarded by many as a myth or a romance. But we see no reason to question any of the facts here stated.

Judgment in laying out the plan, working with and not against nature, and becoming vigilance in superintending the labour of the servants employed, may convert many two acres, now a source of annual expense, into self-supporting if not actually profitable adventures. The third head, of Handicraft, introduces us to the wonder-working manufactories which stud the land. The descriptions are models for perspicuity. We select for extract a passage from the chapter, in the first department, on "Follies in Food." At a time when hundreds of families in every county in England are suffering inconvenience from the want of competent and well-trained servants, and especially from the scarcity of cooks fit to be trusted with a simple joint, the subject is well worthy of attention. He would be a public benefactor who would organize a training college for cooks, housemaids, laundresses, &c. Certificates of good conduct and skill given at the close of the required period of training, would procure at once for their possessors eligible situations and good wages. Such an establishment might be made invaluable, and might receive and train both servants and their future mistresses. To a man of practical sense, it would enhance the charms of one whom he regarded as the companion of his future life, to know that she had been admitted as an honorary associate of a domestic and culinary college.

"A new saying has recently obtained a wide circulation—'That you should discharge your cook for no offence short of murder.' Send her away, and you will never have another: for two real cooks in a lifetime are more than any one has a right to expect. Why are there so few cooks? Simply because the demand for them has declined. So it is, in the very face of the new saying. Cooks are wanted more than ever; but not good ones, because housewives do not know how to set about requiring high qualities in a cook, and are accustomed to put up with what they can get, or to hire on blind speculation. Middle-class housewives in England cannot cook, generally speaking: and, moreover, they do not know what to require, what to order, and how far to superintend. Their mothers did not teach them; we have no schools for the homely domestic arts; and how should they know any more of housewifery than of law, physic, or divinity? If the truth were known, this is one of the depressing influences which bear down the spirit and health of the maidenhood of England. Thousands of girls are painfully conscious of ignorance which is, and ought to be, regarded as a disgrace; and, when intending to marry, a heavy weight of care sits at the heart from the sense of the chances against their being able to make their husbands' home comfortable, and the scene of complacency that the home of every good wife should be. After marriage it is worse. If the deficiency is repaired, it is through severe humiliation on the one part, and great forbearance on the other; and the cases are few in which it can be thoroughly repaired.

"What is to be done? for cooking does not come by nature, nor even ordering a table by observation. The art must be learned, like other arts, by proper instruction. We want, and we must have, schools of domestic management, now that every home is not such a school. Mothers can, at least, teach their daughters to know one sort of meat from another, and one joint from another, and, in a rougher or more thorough way, what to order in the everyday course and for guests. Thus much, then, every girl should know, from childhood upwards. A little practice of observation in the markets would soon teach a willing learner to distinguish prime articles from inferior kinds, and to know what fish, flesh, fowl, and fruits are in season every month in the year. We have seen ladies buying pork under a sweltering summer sun, and inquiring for geese in January and July, and taking up with skinny rabbits in May, and letting the season of mackerel, herrings, salmon, and all manner of fish pass over unused.

"Everybody is glad to hear of the introduction of cookery into industrial schools, here and there. But much more than this is wanted; and there can be little doubt that if well-qualified cooks would open schools in London and all our large towns for the instruction of ladies and housekeepers, they would meet with signal success. It is probably true that almost every little girl is fond of the household arts, and delights in cooking, especially; and it is certainly true that a multitude of young ladies, married and single, would give all they are worth to be as much at home at the head of their households as their grandmothers were. Till this new-old branch of female education is placed within reach of the whole sex, there will be sickness and mortality, as well as waste of the national resources, from the whole of society being at the mercy of its cooks—not a tenth part of whom are worthy of the honourable name."—Pp. 32—34.

Hymns for Mothers and Children. Compiled by the Author of "Violet," "Daisy," &c. Small 4to. Pp. 287. Boston—Walker, Wise and Co. 1861.

This beautiful volume, with its clear type, spacious margin, its delicate tinted paper, its binding in *mauve*, and, above all, its varied and beautiful selection of little poems for the nursery and parlour, will, we doubt not, receive the welcome which it well deserves from mothers and children. We owe the work to one of the compilers of "Hymns of the Ages." Her object, as stated in the Preface, has been "to collect devout, entertaining and suggestive poetry, morning and evening hymns, and those calculated to stimulate the imagination, refine the taste, and train the child's heart to become strong, humane and brave, as well as keep it gentle, reverent and pure." The subjects are arranged under six divisions, and are progressive, the general titles of the several parts being, Children (*Babes*), Young Children, Nature, Religious Instruction (1, The Heavenly Father; 2, The Good Shepherd; 3, Morning and Evening Hymns; 4, Miscellaneous), Older Children, and The End. Among the authors from whose works the editress has culled these fragrant and beautiful bouquets are, Mary Howitt, Leigh Hunt, Keble, the Taylor family, Whittier, Mrs. Follen, Pierpont, Charles and Mary Lamb, Mrs. Osgood, Longfellow, Mrs. Gilman, Kingsley and Rev. W. Calvert. Good as the collection is, it might have been improved by a wider selection. The "Lyra Innocentium" would have furnished much more than we find here. Sir John Bowring's "Matins and Vespers" is rich in poems of the kind required. The lines entitled, "To a Violet," "Love of Home," "Home Joys," "Home Sorrows," "Birth" and "Baptism," might with advantage have had a place in this collection. We miss, too, some beautiful lines by Bulfinch, viz. his hymn on the "Omnipresence," "The Mother's Song" and the "Early Dead."

We select, as a specimen of the extracts admitted, Mr. Calvert's lines entitled, "A Mother's Recompence:"

"What can a mother's heart repay,
In after years,
For watchful night and weary day
Beside the cradle passed away,
And anxious tears?
To see her dear one tread the earth
In life and health and childish mirth.

What can a mother's heart repay
 For a later care,—
 For words that heavenward point the way,
 For counsel against passion's sway,
 And earnest prayer?
 To watch her little pilgrims press
 Along the road to holiness.
 This will a mother's heart repay,—
 If that loved band,
 Amidst life's doubtful battle-fray,
 By grace sustained, shall often say,
 'Next to God's hand,
 All of true happiness we know,
 Mother, to thy dear self we owe.'"

Surely the better lines of Southeby, the one surpassing gem of the Curse of Kehama, ought to have been added :

"They sin who tell us Love can die,
 With life all other passions fly,
 All others are but vanity.
 In Heaven Ambition cannot dwell,
 Nor Avarice in the vaults of Hell;
 Earthly those passions of the Earth,
 They perish where they have their birth;
 But Love is indestructible.
 Its holy flame for ever burneth,
 From Heaven it came, to Heaven returneth;
 Too oft on Earth a troubled guest,
 At times deceived, at times opprest,
 It here is tried and purified,
 Then hath in Heaven its perfect rest;
 It soweth here with toil and care,
 But the harvest-time of Love is there.
 Oh! when a mother meets on high
 The babe she lost in infancy,
 Hath she not then, for pains and fears,
 The day of woe, the watchful night,
 For all her sorrow, all her tears,
 An overpayment of delight?"

Ninety Days' Worth of Europe. By Edward E. Hale. Post 8vo. Pp. 224.
 Boston—Walker, Wise and Co. 1861.

MR. HALE is a tantalizing writer. He ought to have given us more or none. He essays an impossibility in concentrating the essence of ninety days in Europe in a thin and not closely-printed volume. Spite of a little affectation, there is so much good sense and right feeling in what he has given, that we could have wished he had prepared a full narrative, or printed his journal and letters bodily. He crammed two visits to England and one to Ireland, a tour through Germany, Switzerland and Italy, into his ninety days. We will not stop to prove how unwise this mode of travelling is, and how vapid the impressions of a tour must be in which a year's work is compressed into three months.

Towards England and its institutions Mr. Hale's feelings are what every cultivated and amiable Englishman would wish to feel towards

America. He speaks with glowing admiration of the British Museum and its glorious reading-room. He has, however, unintentionally diminished the capacity of the shelves in that wondrous room. It contains, not, as he states, 60,000 volumes, but 1,500,000. It is the *library of reference*, all the volumes of which are contained at the base of the building beneath the first gallery of the reading-room, which contains the number he specifies. Mr. Hale visited our two great Universities, and studied their usages with deep interest. The passage which we extract is interesting; but we doubt whether the college ambition which struck our traveller is rightly ascribed exclusively to the material rewards which wait on success. It must in part be attributed to the spirit of competition or combativeness (call it what you will) that enters so largely into the English character. The eagerness for academic honours is found to prevail as much in schools and colleges which possess none of the resources at the command of Oxford and Cambridge for helping on the student in his after career in life.

"The amiable rivalry, if I may call it so, between the colleges in the same university, introduces peculiarities which I think the English gentlemen themselves are unconscious of, but which strike a stranger. I ascribe it to this, in a measure, that the persecution of freshmen appears to be wholly unknown. There is plenty of it in the schools and in military colleges; but, I think, not in the universities. I am sure, on the other hand, that there is rather a habit, on the part of undergraduates who have been established for some time in a college, if they be particularly attached to their own college, to go up early, at the beginning of a term, for the special purpose of welcoming new-comers. There is a little of the feeling with which the New-Haven men canvass very early the promising freshmen, to induce them to enter the rival college societies. Such, at least, is my theory; though I think nobody stated it to me so on the ground. The fact is, that a freshman, on his arrival, meets a courteous welcome from everybody who belongs to his college. There is an unconscious *esprit de corps*, on the part of each college, to make a young man feel that he has done right in coming to them, instead of coming to any of the other colleges in the same university. Nay, it is possible that an undecided student may change his plans, and select another college from that which he had proposed.

"I may add, that almost every one who comes either to Oxford or Cambridge has been already trained to the responsibilities and self-control of a gentleman. In almost every case, he has been used to social life, and is accustomed to bear himself with propriety in the presence both of elders and juniors. In other words, that has been done for him at the public schools, which, in many cases, has to be done at our colleges. But the average age of a Cambridge or Oxford freshman is scarcely, if at all, greater than that of a freshman at our Cambridge; and, I think, not at all greater than that of freshmen at New Haven.

"I never, till now, understood why the English students cared so much more for college honors than we. When I was in college, I do not think there were five men in the class who would have crossed the street to raise their college rank; and I think our impression was correct of its worthlessness in its minor details. One would be glad to be in the best quarter-part of the class; and that is about all. But on the ground, in England, I saw at once that their college honors were honors with a great deal directly springing from them. The University of Cambridge, for instance, has the direct control of the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of pounds yearly. So much money is paid to clergymen or tutors or professors, or other people whom she has appointed. Behind this, there are large series of honorable and influential positions, to which the lines of promotion are through these offices which she

herself directly fills. Masterships in the public schools; various offices in the church, up to the highest,—are, in the long-run, given to men whom the two universities have distinguished as worthy of preferment. The young man, therefore, who works for college honors, is working to take the first direct steps in an honorable literary or ecclesiastical career. For that career, success, even as an undergraduate in college, is a very important beginning. It is as a midshipman might seek to distinguish himself in the first steps of his profession; or as a young man entering the diplomatic corps in Europe might know, that, with him, early notoriety would tell all the way through. With us, on the other hand, I know no single advantage in a man's subsequent career derived from high rank in college. There are, undoubtedly, many very great advantages which spring from the habits and acquisitions which give him that position; but, beyond the college walls, nobody knows or cares more than to know, that, on the whole, he availed himself honorably of the advantages of the university.”—Pp. 191—194.

Mr. Hale was the author of a series of papers which appeared in the Christian Register on the Religion of Europe. We are pleased to observe that our traveller did not forget his religious friends when in England and Ireland. Here is one of the closing paragraphs of the volume. He is at Cork, the day before he begins his return voyage across the Atlantic.

“I asked for and found the Unitarian Church,—the Presbyterian Church of the Munster Synod, I think it is. Surely I must be wrong about the hour. One old woman and I are the only people inside! No: just then enters a beadle, and shows the minister up stairs. Oh the refreshment of that service, as of Christmas Day's in Manchester! Sixty seconds made it certain that I had not mistaken the place; and then the luxury of worshipping God in my own language and my own way, instead of adapting myself to Edward VIth's, to John Calvin's, or to St. Ambrose's or Hildebrand's! It proved, as soon as the congregation rose, that the greater part were in the galleries, where, as I sat at first, I could not see them. With national unpunctuality also, many arrived after the service began.

“I introduced myself to Mr. Whitelegge, the minister; of whom I may say, without impropriety perhaps, that he had preached one of the best sermons I ever heard. The weather had cleared; and he kindly showed me some of the most beautiful points of this beautiful city.”—Pp. 221, 222.

Mysteries of Life, Death and Futurity, illustrated from the best and latest Authorities. By Horace Welby. Pp. 276. Kent and Co. 1861.

We might, if we chose, pick a quarrel with the editor of this book about his somewhat ambitious title. “‘Mysteries of Life,’ &c., is neither more nor less than a volume of extracts, chiefly from the writings of living authors, on moral, scientific and religious topics. We willingly concede that the editor is a well-read man in modern English literature, and also that he has used his scissors and paste with discretion, and thrown in here and there a discriminating criticism or an apt illustration. He distinctly recognizes in his Preface that ‘the characteristic of the present age is freedom of inquiry, thought and discussion, and these with greater latitude than can be traced in the history of any former period.’” He further states that he has undertaken his work “with the view of concentrating within its focus the views and opinions of some of the leading writers of the present day, and placing them before the reader in so popular a form and setting as to adapt them for a larger class than would be likely to consult the authorities themselves whence the substance of this volume has been derived.” Mr. Horace Welby is unmis-

takably orthodox, notwithstanding his professions of freedom, and in many cases fails to rise above the *letter* and to reach the *spirit* of holy writ.

He applies, when quoting a passage from Dr. Arnold and illustrating it by an autobiographical extract from Coleridge, the term "Sceptics" to Unitarians. Coleridge, as himself avows, went much further in his scepticism than the freest Unitarians of his day. It was his boast that he came round to orthodoxy on the other side of the circle of truth. But in truth Coleridge, in his rooted antipathy to Bibliolatry, struck a fatal wound in the side of orthodoxy. To his influence, how much do we owe of the present free-thinking among the bolder spirits of the Church of England?

Mr. Horace Welby quotes approvingly a passage from Locke's "profound Essay on the Human Understanding," shewing that some men become "Sceptics" by not duly observing the extent of the human capacity and the horizon which sets the bounds between mental light and darkness. Mr. Welby would probably shrink from applying the term Sceptic to Mr. Locke, and yet his Paraphrase of Paul, his Reasonableness of Christianity, and his *Adversaria* on the Trinity, leave no reasonable doubt that he was a confirmed Unitarian.

Under the general heading of "Belief and Scepticism," we have a statement respecting Lord Bolingbroke which will be new to some of our readers.

"It appears from an entry in the *Diaries and Correspondence of the Rt. Hon. George Rose*, edited by the Rev. L. V. Harcourt, and published in 1860, —that, by a letter of Lord Bolingbroke's, dated 1740, he had actually written some Essays dedicated to the Earl of Marchmont of a very different tendency from his former works. These essays, on his death, fell into the hands of Mr. Mallet, his executor, who had, at the latter end of his life, acquired a decided influence over him, and they did not appear among his lordship's works published by Mallet; nor have they since been heard of. From whence it must be naturally conjectured that they were destroyed by the latter, from what reason cannot now be known: possibly, to conceal from the world the change, such as it was, in his lordship's sentiments in the latter end of his life, and to avoid the discredit of his former works. In which respect, he might have been influenced either by regard for the noble Viscount's consistency, or by a desire not to impair the pecuniary advantage he expected from the publication of his lordship's works.

"Upon this Mr. Harcourt observes:

"The letter to Lord Marchmont here referred to, has a note appended to it by Sir George Rose, the editor of the *Marchmont Papers*, who takes a very different view of the contents from his father. He gravely remarks, that as the posthumous disclosure of Lord Bolingbroke's inveterate hostility to Christianity lays open to view as well the bitterness as the extent of it, so the manner of that disclosure precludes any doubt of the earnestness of his desire to give the utmost efficiency and publicity to that hostility, as soon as it could safely be done: that is, as soon as death should shield him against responsibility to man. Sir George saw plainly enough that when he promised in these essays to vindicate religion against divinity and God against man, he was retracting all that he had occasionally said against Christianity; he was upholding the religion of Theism against the doctrines of the Bible, and the God of nature against the revelation of God to man."—Pp. 102, 103.

One serious objection we must make to this volume, and that is the inconvenient smallness of the type. A little book, to be often taken up and read with pleasure, must not necessitate the straining of the eye.

INTELLIGENCE.

THE CHURCH-RATE QUESTION.

An enormous political blunder committed by Mr. Disraeli in a speech spoken during the Parliamentary recess at Anerley, has served to blow into a flame the embers of this fire, which seemed at the close of the last session to be getting somewhat dull. Encouraged by the decreasing majority in favour of Sir John Trelawny's Bill for the Abolition of Church-rates, the Conservative leader doubtless thought he saw the way to obtain that political capital of which he and his party stand somewhat in need, and gave forth the word of command to the clergy and the Conservative party, "On the church-rate question no surrender!" Some of the more far-seeing Conservatives demur to the prudence of this course; but the clergy, who from the days of Lord Clarendon downwards have in political matters shewn little practical wisdom, have echoed the cry of their leader to his heart's content, and are now sending in shoals of petitions to Parliament praying for the perpetuity of church-rates. One of the Bishops (Henry of Exeter) has also done his part to blow the church-rate question into a hot flame by advising the archdeacons and clergy of his diocese to contend for and never abandon church-rates as a practical declaration of the principle of the union of Church and State. In the face of a defiant lay and episcopal challenge of this kind, it was impossible for Dissenters to keep silent on a question involving not only religious peace, but, in some of its phases, the essential principle of religious liberty. A conference was accordingly called together in the Metropolis by many of the opponents of church-rates, including distinguished laymen and ministers of the several Dissenting denominations. The conference took place at Freemasons' Hall on the 12th of February, and was attended by nearly a thousand persons, many of whom were delegates representing churches and associated bodies in distant parts of the kingdom. The Unitarians were not unrepresented on the occasion: there were present, Mr. James Heywood, Rev. R. B. Aspland, Rev. W. Forster, Rev. Wm. James, Rev. Edmund Kell, Rev. R. B. Maclellan, Rev. Edward Talbot, Rev. R. Shelley, Rev. P. W. Clayden, Rev. F. Bishop. The speeches and resolutions were firm in principle, but moderate in tone, and indicated the determination of the assembly not to rest contented with anything short of the entire abolition of church-rates. A Committee

was appointed, which sits daily at Fendall's Hotel. It was resolved to raise a fund of not less than £3000 for defraying the necessary expenses of the application to Parliament and the agitation of the question throughout the country. To that fund we hope our Unitarian friends who wish to see church-rates abolished will without delay contribute. The Secretary of the Committee is Rev. T. N. Langridge, 2, Serjeants' Inn, Fleet Street; and the Bankers appointed to receive the money raised are Messrs. Olding, Sharp and Co., St. Clement's Lane, London. We have little doubt that the result of the struggle will be a disappointment alike to the political and the ecclesiastical leaders who have provoked it. It will neither strengthen the Conservative party nor cement the union of Church and State, but, if conducted to the end by the friends of religious liberty in the spirit in which they have opened the campaign, will add another triumph to liberal principles.

THE BILL TO ABOLISH CHURCH-RATES.

The following is the Bill, the same as last session, prepared and brought into the House of Commons by Sir J. Trelawny, Mr. Dillwyn and Sir Charles Douglas:

Whereas Church-rates have for some years ceased to be made or collected in many parishes by reason of the opposition thereto, and in many other parishes where Church-rates have been made the levying thereof has given rise to litigation and ill-feeling: And whereas it is expedient that the power to take Church-rates should be abolished: Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

1. From and after the passing of this Act no Church-rate shall be made or levied in any parish in England or Wales.

2. Provided always, that in any parish where a sum of money is at the time of the passing of this Act due on the security of Church-rates to be made or levied in such parish under the provisions of any Act of Parliament, such rates may still be made and levied pursuant to such provisions for the purpose of paying off the money so due, but not otherwise, until the same shall have been liquidated.

3. Any Church-rate made at any time before the passing of this Act may be col-

lected and recovered in the same way as if this Act had not been passed.

4. This Act may be cited as “The Church-rate Abolition Act, 1861.”

THE EPISCOPAL CENSURE OF “ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.”

The English Bishops have done a very rash act in publicly expressing, through the Primate, in reply to an address to him, a strong condemnation of the Essays and Reviews. In this document they say they cannot understand how the opinions of the Essayists can be held consistently with an honest subscription to the formularies of the Church, with many of the fundamental doctrines of which they appear to be essentially at variance. But they go on to say that it is matter of their gravest consideration whether the language in which these views are expressed is such as to make their publication an act which could be visited in the ecclesiastical courts, or to justify the synodical condemnation of the book which contains them. Now surely the Archbishops and Bishops would have done well first of all to settle this point, and see whether the writers whom they censure have really been guilty of an ecclesiastical offence; because, if not, there can be no justification for the official censure now promulgated.

This episcopal act has called forth a host of critics in the daily papers. In the *Times* of Feb. 18, a writer, who signs himself “Anglicanus,” after referring to three previous episcopal blunders—1, in the Hampden case; 2, the Papal aggression; 3, the condemnation of Bishop Gobat—finds fault with the present manifesto on these grounds:

“It is an unqualified condemnation of certain opinions, without any indication of what these opinions severally are, or how widely the condemnation is meant to extend. It attacks five living clergymen of eminent learning and diverse sentiments in language almost amounting to a libel, without drawing any distinction between the writers, without specifying the precise charges against them, or the formularies of the Church which they are supposed to contradict. * * * It intimates that the gravest doubt exists as to the possibility of visiting the publication of these opinions in the ecclesiastical courts; and yet, notwithstanding this doubt, it ventures, without a trial, to pronounce a condemnation which nothing but the clearest legal proof could justify. It gives no indication of the opinions of any one of the subscribing Bishops on any one of the points at issue, although it is perfectly well known that

on these points many of the Bishops are widely at variance with each other, and that some of them have published opinions coincident with those contained in the book which is condemned. And this document, so grave in its character and its results, if it means what it says, is suddenly published without any warning to the persons accused, although some of them have the strongest claims on the courtesy and justice of those who thus accuse them.”

That the Bishops have committed a serious blunder in meddling with this controversy, time will probably shew. They have given dangerous encouragement to theological combinations of a fanatical character, and they do what they can to abuse the minds of their countrymen that the right of private judgment is respected by the Church of England. We shall presently have a Protestant Index Expurgatorius, and a standing Committee of the Bishops must from year to year decide what books shall be read by the members of their Church, and what are inconsistent with the creeds, articles and homilies of the Church. How the writers of the “Essays and Reviews” will submit to the rebuke of their spiritual masters remains to be seen. This movement *ought* to swell the ranks of Nonconformity by adding to them hundreds of men of large and liberal views who are conscious of their inability to make their notions on theology square at every point with the symbols of the Church of England. That such will be the effect is more than we venture to predict; for we have before seen that it is an awful leap for a Churchman to take to throw himself into avowed Nonconformity.

OPENING OF A CHAPEL FOR UNITARIAN WORSHIP IN THE COUNTY OF DURHAM.

If Church-of-England “Essayists,” and clergymen, and learned men in general, were as frank and open in discarding what they are persuaded is untrue as plain working men, what a rapid change we should see come over our country and the religious institutions of our land!

On Sunday, Feb. 10, a handsome little chapel, beautifully situated a short distance from Crook, near Durham, was opened by a band of converts to our faith for Unitarian worship. For some time past, one or two of the families in this neighbourhood have received a monthly supply of one of our cheap periodicals. The number has gradually increased, until now about twenty families have become subscribers. Little tracts were also sent among them, the gift of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association to the neigh-

bouring churches; and these were lent about and read, and became the subject of much conversation. Some time ago they were advised by one of our ministers in the north to join together on the Sunday and hold a religious service, which advice they followed, and met in one of the friend's houses for reading the Scriptures and worship. It appears that not long since one of the Methodist local preachers, Mr. Thos. Brown, had expressed some doubts on the truthfulness and scripturality of the doctrine of eternal torments. He was rather roughly handled by some of his brethren for such doubts, and at first suspended from preaching; and then, on being strictly questioned and found to have imbibed some other Unitarian doctrines, he was expelled from fellowship with the Methodist church. The disbelief in eternal punishment led him to make further inquiries and to test some of the religious notions common among the Methodists, and to abandon them. He was deprived of his preaching appointments first, then of his class leadership and membership, and told he would go to the devil for his heresy.—A new chapel had been built at Rumbey Hill, near Crook. Some difference among the people with the trustees led to the sale of the chapel. The gentleman who bought it has let it to our new friends there at a rental for one year. They hope it will be continued to them for many years. Mr. Brown opened the chapel avowedly for Christian Unitarian worship on the 10th, and preached his first sermons on the "Love of God." The chapel was well filled. A great number of valuable Unitarian tracts has been sent among the congregation during the last few weeks. We learn they are read with great interest. The whole of the chapels in the locality resound with preaching against Unitarianism, and in consequence much inquiry is directed to the subject. Two of the members of the new place of worship, we learn, will be able to conduct the services every Sabbath-day. They will be glad to have the aid of any of the ministers and lay preachers in the north of England, or any Unitarian minister who can conduct an occasional service among them. They have already received the promise of help that will tend to join them to the brotherhood of our churches.

A CANADIAN CONFESSOR.

The following interesting letter explains itself. We may premise that when Mr. Le Fevre was separated from his flock at Sherbrooke, they offered him an address attesting his high personal and clerical

merits, and expressing their regret at the separation.

To the Bishop and Clergy of the Church of England, in Canada, the following statement is respectfully submitted by the subscriber:

That, in the year 1821, the subscriber received ordination at the hands of the Bishop of London, and being adopted as a missionary by the "Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts," was sent to Canada, and appointed by the Right Rev. Jacob Mountain, D.D., Bishop of Quebec, to the church in Sherbrooke, C.E.

That at the close of the year 1829, the Right Rev. James Stewart, D.D., being then Bishop of Quebec, the subscriber was deprived of his living for entertaining and avowing doctrines considered at variance with the Articles of the Church.

That the objectionable doctrines were: first, that the subscriber held the belief of universal redemption from sin and consequent misery; "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times God would gather together in one all things in Christ," so that when the Good Shepherd penned his fold for immortality, there should not one be wanting, but "there should be one fold and one Shepherd."

That this confession of faith on the part of the subscriber was not, however, sufficient cause for deposing him, was acknowledged by the Bishop himself. The Articles of the Church touch not this matter, and the 42nd Article under Edward VI., which condemned the doctrine, was stricken out under Elizabeth, thus leaving the subject open to the liberty of each man's convictions. It may be further stated that both bishops and clergy of the Established Church have not hesitated to avow their belief in this doctrine.

Secondly, the only remaining doctrine held by the subscriber as conflicting with the Articles of the Church, related to the Trinity. That the subscriber acknowledged one Supreme Being as God, and that while he recognized a unity of Christ and the Holy Spirit in the great work of sanctification and redemption, he did not conceive that unity of operation necessarily involved unity of person.

That this construction of the doctrine of the Trinity was deemed sufficient to cut him off from the communion and ministry of the Church, and not for any moral dereliction, the address from the people of his charge will abundantly testify. He would only remark that he feels the language beyond his deserts. He merely claims having conscientiously discharged his duties according to his best humble ability.

That the subscriber should feel that he has been hardly dealt with, is but natural; and his relatives in England, of whom many are clergymen, sympathize in this feeling. To them it has been a grief and mortification, and in view of the happy state of things existing between his parishioners and himself, they cannot but consider his ejectionment, if not an unjust, still an unnecessarily severe measure.

That the subscriber has been willing patiently to "bide his time," the last thirty years, since leaving the Church, hoping, what has really taken place in all denominations of Christians, a more tolerant spirit and larger charity towards those whose opinions may differ in points of disputed doctrines.

That in the "Christian Observer" he has lately seen a review of the "Oxford Essayists," clergymen occupying the "high place" in the Church, the extreme heterodoxy of whose views is as much deeper than that which caused the suspension of the subscriber, as the darkness of night is from the soft shadows of twilight.

The reviewer shews the following opinions unmistakably set forth: the Bible subordinate, not supreme; the Bible not infallible, but often erroneous; the miracles of scripture incredible; the Bible superstitiously venerated.

The authors of these essays are as follows: Rev. Frederic Temple, D.D., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, Head Master of Rugby School, Chaplain to the Earl of Dunleath; Rev. Rowland Williams, D.D., Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew, St. David's College, Vicar of Broad Chalke, Wilts; Rev. Baden Powell, M.A., F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford; Rev. Henry Bristow Wilson, B.D., Vicar of Great Staughton, Hunts; Rev. C. W. Goodwin, M.A.; Rev. Mark Pattison, B.D.; Rev. Benjamin Jowett, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford.

To these "Essayists" may be added the name of Rev. Frederic D. Maurice, recently presented to the church of St. Peter's, Vere Street, London, though openly avowing Unitarian and Universalist opinions.

That the subscriber, having preached "a common salvation" for twenty years since leaving the Church, has for the last ten years retired from the public ministry to private life. That he neither seeks nor desires place, preferment or emolument, but thinks that while heresies of far darker complexion are openly proclaimed, without detriment to the authors, he may justly claim from those in authority some testimonial or credential establishing his right to the title of a clergyman of the Church,

releasing him from the restraint by which he has been so many years bound. He feels conscious that "he has nothing laid to his charge worthy of bonds."

C. F. LE FEVRE.
Milwaukee, Wis. U.S.

THE EAST-INDIAN MISSION.

We have lately received from Calcutta Mr. Dall's Ninth Report of his Mission, and extract from it some of the more interesting passages. From the exordium we can only select one passage, in which a remarkable tribute (as coming from a republican) is paid to our Queen, and the growing feeling of love to her in the hearts of her subjects in India:

Actions preach better than words, and work than talk. So we are less concerned to establish special theories of faith, than Christian living and the gospel life. Could one organize even the daily industry of her lazy and rapacious multitudes, her narrow-minded, immoral and mutually hating populations, into the willing inter-dependence of one kind and pure, one large and diversified, but united family,—he would advance India several centuries toward a gospel condition and a true church. While it is our mission to *preach the gospel*, "instant, in season, out of season," upon its own *Unitarian* and broadly catholic principles, we rejoice to find helpers, if not in persons then in things,—e.g. in great reproductive public works, like the post-office and the railway, in improved communications, in a daily enlarging commerce, in an enlightened system of finance, and, above all, in the confessed allegiance of British India to one governmental head and Queen. There are encouraging facts more immediate to our own small labours and personal share in the glory of uniting India to herself and to her God, and these form the burden of the present, our ninth Report. To this I now pass, not without devout thankfulness for these five years' success to an Almighty Father. *Praise to His name, that the people for whom we labour begin to love one Christian soul—Victoria—more than the most lauded of their goddesses, their Kali, Surrasuttee, Shorbo-mangola, or even ten-handed Durga herself; not to mention others, whom in fear they ignorantly worship and propitiate with untold wealth and personal sacrifice.* Heaven smiles and says to us, *Go on: God will do his part in India's sure salvation.* A listening faith may hear the words, "Behold, I come quickly! Lo, I, Jesus, am with you always, even to the end of the world."

Our Mission-house.—By the blessing of

God we are permitted at length to call a mission-house our own. We are no longer confined to a mission-room or to a suite of rooms, as at No. 4, Tank Square, out of which we may be turned at a month's notice. We have now a quite eligible building at a fair rent, for an indefinite term of years. Though on the edge of the native town, we are also in one of the broadest, best-aired, best-drained, best-lighted streets of the city. We are nearly opposite a well-frequented Christian church known as the Union chapel. We are but a few doors east of the almost consecrated spot where Rammohun Roy opened his "Unitarian press, Dhurumtollah," and in 1823 published at his own expense the ripest and most elaborate of his works, viz. his "Final Appeal in Defence of the Precepts of Jesus." Not without hard economy and extra private labour has a mission-house been secured. One or two days in the week given by the missionary to reporting the doings of the Indian Legislature, at about 200 rupees a month, have supplied (some 1500 rupees) the means of furnishing this building so as to fit it for a large daily school in the five lower rooms, and above for a chapel, a library, a reading-room and for comfortable residence.

The mission now begins the sixth year of its (American) renewal in a proper home. The Treasurer's report accompanying this will shew how largely the pecuniary charge of the mission-house still rests on the private earnings and extra labour of your missionary; and it is for our friends in England and America to say whether this charge shall continue to lie heavily on one whose health may not permanently sustain it.

We transferred our religious services to the new mission-hall on the first Sunday in May. On the 15th of May, 1860, we commenced a school, at a small charge for instruction, in the rooms of the first floor of the building, and advertised our purpose to give to all comers the rudiments of a good education, and even a preparation for the university, in English and Bengali; besides early morning classes in useful arts. It is our purpose by six or eight hours of *daily* personal intercourse to bring the best and happiest moral influences to bear upon at least 200 or 300 pupils. Hymns, to bind soul to soul and all to God, are recited and sung by the whole school, while all Scriptures are open to be consulted in the library at any time by any applicant. We thus use the mission-house in part for a large and increasing school of men and boys (Bengalees), and reserve the upper rooms for social gatherings, evening lec-

tures and discussions; or on Sundays for preaching the gospel and for a Sunday-school, as also for the permanent residence of the American missionary and his English schoolmaster, who has consented to act temporarily as the mission treasurer, with a merchant of the city to audit his accounts. The rooms are not all fully occupied, and we await suggestions from our home friends and supporters as to some of their prospective uses.

The daily business of the missionary, like that of every man who is in regular employment, consists to some extent of routine occupations. Day after day these are met instinctively as one's morning and evening meal. From habit they commence at or before daylight, and in the main are such as the following:—1. Writing or study from four to six a.m., and then the refreshing bath. 2. A walk for health until sunrise, often with Bengali gospel or Hindoo-stanee phrase-book or Sanscrit pamphlet in hand. 3. The hour first after sunrise is given to visiting such public institutions as open with the day—like the Mission-houses, the School of Industrial Art, the Government Ward's Institution for young Rajahs and Zemindars, &c., conversing with and encouraging their native teachers and pupils. 4. Return to morning papers and breakfast. 5. Bible reading and family prayer. 6. Writing up journal of the previous day, replying to letters, &c. 7. From about ten o'clock a.m., the Bengali and Sanscrit pundit has had the missionary's time until noon—[P.S. It is now given to teaching]—unless special calls arise. 8. Writing till dinner, at two or three o'clock, and preparing sermons or tracts or articles for the press or important letters. 9. Conversation, less important writing, proof-reading, copying, or attending committees of schools, &c. 10. Receiving daily visits from young men between four and six p.m., as they are on their way home from office, answering their many questions, chiefly bearing on religion, and giving or lending tracts and books, some of the latter being also occasionally purchased by them. 11. A walk for fresh air, out of rooms usually closed to exclude the heat, between sun and sun. 12. Attending meetings and lectures, or addressing and lecturing to societies of young men (Hindoos for the most part).

The above is something like the course of a common day, though it varies with the season of the year, particularly in the four cooler months. This routine, it remains to be said, is crossed and interrupted by not a few incidental engagements.

Our Sunday work.—The attendance on the regular Sunday services in Calcutta

has been smaller this year than on any of the preceding ones. It has been twice interrupted by changing our place of worship, and we had no Calcutta services while Mr. D. was journeying among the northern and north-western cities. The Lord's-day, with a gospel observance of it, has been uniformly kept holy, but under various circumstances. During July and August our small Calcutta circle of fellow-worshippers met in the old place, No. 4, Tank Square. Then for three months there was no meeting in Calcutta, though, with a family of eight or nine Unitarians on board, Mr. D. held service on most of those thirteen Sundays in the cabin of a steam-boat. Returning to Calcutta, we attempted a service, from the first Sunday in December to the last in April, in a large parlour or hall at No. 4, Chowringhee Road, where the attendance never exceeded twenty and averaged twelve or thirteen. On the first Sunday in May, we consecrated with our opening service a new mission-room, No. 85, Dhurrumtollah, the up-hall of a two-storied building, whose lower story, as we have said, is devoted to our schools and classes, partly in useful arts, and where the attendance already exceeds our most sanguine expectations. This building seems adapted to all our purposes, both of residence and labour, educational and religious. The sum which well-appointed Calcutta lodging-houses charge for a single room, with food, is 100 rupees a month. For a rent of 95 rupees a month, we have secured for two years, and in perpetuity if we choose, the two halls and eight or nine rooms of a house well fitted for the home of our mission and its workmen. Here we are fulfilling a more palpable and well-defined mission than ever before, with five or six teachers aiding our work. Some fifteen or twenty persons came together here on the second Sunday in May, to hear our Persian brother Abdool Mussih's account of his conversion from Islam, first to Trinitarian and then to Unitarian Christianity; but on the other nine Sundays (which bring up the year) we have had only from seven to ten persons present as fellow-worshippers, with about the same number in the Sunday-school. What the Sunday attendance may yet be, we shall test by several methods before we despair of having a small and regular church of the mission. We work under high encouragement on every other day of the week, upwards of 200 pupils having attended, partly from half-past six to half-past eight o'clock a.m., and partly from ten a.m. to four o'clock in the afternoon.

During the first half of our current year, we had three months' or thirteen Sundays'

services at our old rooms, No. 4, Tank Square. The *average* number attendant on these occasions, including morning preaching and Mr. D.'s evening circle of children at No. 12, Loudon Street, was between twenty and twenty-one; the lowest number eight, the highest thirty. The number of different persons who came during that time, whether regularly or occasionally, to hear the word of our gospel, was sixty-five. If to this be added forty or fifty (on the steamer and in Allahabad and other cities) who willingly listened to our preaching, we have for the first half of the current year 105 to 115 *different listeners*, persons met round a Unitarian pastor for united thought and prayer. This seems, after all, not far from our accustomed numerical list for the *half year*—this being from July to December, 1859. Departures, by reason of death or removal or other causes, have left us just now but a very small remnant, and our proper church is become "as a cottage in a vine-yard," a mere handful. But seven in all met together on the first Sunday in May at the new mission-house, to ask God's blessing on our new "stone of help,"—namely, two Englishmen, one American, one Persian Christian, and two inquiring Hindoos, not baptized, yet seemingly desirous of honouring Jesus, and glad, in *their own way*, to proclaim him Lord, to the glory of God the Father. On the following Sunday we had more than twice as many present, and our friend Abdool's address (part Hindoo-stanee and part English) was short, clear and satisfactory. Looking at the whole year, it is pleasant to reflect that, the month of September excepted, health and opportunity have always been found whereby to speak the word to some hearers, without the omission of a Lord's-day. Thank God, we have a small band of determined workers in India—(Captain E. S. Mercer, of Peshawur, spent three delightful months with us as he and Abdool were on their way to England)—though a majority of them now reside out of Calcutta, whose root is in themselves and in the Father, and in gospel "liberty, holiness, love." We have been led year by year more and more entirely to the Hindoos, and do not believe, even since the rebellion, that we are "doing too much for them."

Treasurer's report.—Mr. W. T. Johnston, the Treasurer, writes, "I regret to state that, from removals, deaths and other causes, the number of subscribers in India has fallen to five or six, so that we have but a small income from this source. I therefore rejoice to hear that our friends in Christian countries are coming to our aid.

India certainly presents a very rich and wide field for gospel work. Even from my own brief four years' experience in this country, and from occasional conversations with intelligent Hindoos and young men of Bengal, I discover many good influences at work, which are quietly but surely undermining caste and the errors of Brahminism. Though but few are yet ready for an open avowal of Christianity, we are continually meeting with educated men in Bengal who seem in spirit to be almost Christians. After repeatedly enjoying this conviction, I feel confident that the pure and beautiful religion of Jesus, especially as presented by Unitarians, will some day be fully embraced by these men, or, if not, by their children.

"I have followed a sailor's life for a dozen years. During that time a pretty wide sphere of observation, even of missions, has been opened to me among the Pacific islands, in Australia and elsewhere. Let me then deliberately say, that I see in Mr. Dall's method of working—to aid which, if I am wanted and have the health for it, I shall cheerfully devote myself—the best and most surely successful that I ever saw. Let him be well sustained and seconded, and I have no doubt that in course of time he will have a church here, added to the noble school that his extended influence with the natives has already assembled, and which may before long fill all the rooms we can spare for pupils. I need not ask your attention to such facts as that Mr. Dall has sold the horse and vehicle given him some years since by the Committee, and given back the proceeds as mission-money to the cause. In order to shew our friends what is a necessary part of our monthly outlay, I will only say, further, that while Mr. Dall's salary, *all that is paid him in Calcutta*, is 150 rupees a month (and we have no surplus and no fund), I pay out *monthly* for the *two items* of rent and salaries, 317 rupees."

In reply to inquiries from Rev. J. Scott Porter, Mr. Dall thus describes his school :

"1. I opened on the 15th of May, 1860, a school of "useful arts," wherein we teach drawing, book-keeping, short-hand and work connected with the press; and men have already gone out from us to positions of self-support (the best bulwark of new ideas) after three months' tuition, e.g. in book-keeping. Among such students are the best readers of all we print and circulate, and the firmest friends of our cause. In the day-school also, by permission of their parents, already some 15 or 20 boys regularly read Rammohun Roy's Precepts of Jesus, in Bengali. During the first four months of the experiment, 224 boys and young men, each paying his 8 annas to 2 rupees (one to four shillings a month), have come to receive our best things through an English and Bengali education. They also fit themselves if they choose for the university. It is not uncommon to hear complaints of the unimpressibility of the Hindoo mind. This may be true of preaching to casual hearers, or of a certain style of tract and Bible distribution, but is not true of the affectionate contact of young Hindoos with Christian teacher, occupying from two to six hours of their time every day. 2. We have not purchased ground or buildings, but have leased, at the low charge of 95 rupees a month for two years, renewable indefinitely, a well-located building, No. 85, Dhurrumtollah, which is all we want at present to give us daily access to many Hindoos otherwise beyond our reach; though if the means be afforded there need be no limit to the number either of our teachers or pupils. At present, including my own labour, the school has one American, two English, and four Oriental teachers (some of my old friends), faithfully working on meagre salaries, which, with perhaps a single exception, ought to be doubled. Such is the state of society here, that female teachers, if unmarried, would best work in a separate institution, one which we hope to see opened some day for Hindoo girls."

MARRIAGES.

Dec. 27, from Bruce Castle, at All-Hallows' church, Tottenham, by Rev. J. S. Winter, THOMAS EYTON JONES, Esq., surgeon, Wrexham, second son of John Jones, Esq., of Dolawen Rhyd, to SUSANNAH, second daughter of Mortimer MAURICE, Esq., Oak Lodge, Wrexham, formerly minister for seventeen years to the congregation worshiping at Crook's Lane, Chester, the chapel built for Matthew Henry.

Jan. 10, in Holywood meeting-house, by Rev. John M'Caw, Rev. M. A. Moon, of Stannington, near Sheffield, to MARIA, daughter of J. HIGGINS, Esq., of Belfast.

Feb. 2, at the Unitarian chapel, Hull, by Rev. John Shannon, Mr. JOHN ARTHUR HARRIS to Miss MARY ANNE PRIESTLEY.

Feb. 3, at the Mill-Hill chapel, Leeds, by Rev. Thomas Hincks, B.A., Mr. PETER MALLINSON to Miss MARY EARL.

OBITUARY.

Dec. 23, in Ceylon, Mr. JAMES EDWARD JEVONS, second son of Mr. Timothy Jevons, of Liverpool, aged 32 years.

Jan. 18, ANNE, wife of Mr. John HARDING, Sedgley Bank, Higher Broughton, Manchester, aged 75 years.

Jan. 24, JOSEPH GRUNDY, Esq., of Drayton Grange, in the county of Leicester, aged 76. Mr. Grundy was a consistent and liberal member of one of our oldest Nonconformist families, and had the respectful regard of all by whom he was known.

Jan. 26, at Abbey Mount, Tavistock, ANNA EVANS, widow of the Rev. W. Evans, formerly of Parkwood, Tavistock, aged 84 years. The memory of this lady is cherished by many besides the members of her family. She presided with singular success over the domestic arrangements of her husband's school both at Kelworthy and Parkwood, both near Tavistock, in which many gentlemen now occupying positions of respectability and eminence received in part at least their education. In addition, Mrs. Evans for a time conducted the education of several young ladies. Until disabled by the infirmities of age, Mrs. Evans adorned the social circle by her talents and virtues. Many recall with pleasure the graceful hospitality of the worthy minister of Tavistock and his lady. Most important is the aid which the wife of a Dissenting minister may give in extending her husband's usefulness and social influence. Let fidelity in such duty, as exemplified by Mrs. Evans during the long pastorate of her husband at Tavistock, be recorded and remembered with respect.

Since the above was in type, we have received the following :

Mrs. Evans, whose long and well-spent life was closed in peaceful serenity, surrounded by her children and friends, was the beloved wife of the Rev. W. Evans, formerly of Kelworthy and Parkwood. Her father, Mr. Joseph Partridge, was an upright and stanch Presbyterian of the old school. He resided at Taunton, and attended the ministry of Dr. Toulmin, sharing indirectly in the persecution which that excellent man underwent at the same time as Dr. Priestley, on account of the liberality of his religious and political opinions. Mrs. Evans often recalled this eventful

period, when she was called upon nightly to read the papers to a company of gentlemen who met at her father's for the purpose of discussing the all-important questions of the day. She remembered also with much pleasure that Dr. Priestley visited Mr. Partridge on the eve of his departure for America. Mrs. Evans inherited the earnest and energetic spirit of her father, maintaining throughout her life the sublime doctrine of the strict Unity of the Deity, with the personal individuality of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, regarding the mercy and free grace of God as the sure and certain hope on which she might rely when entering a more extended and glorious sphere of existence. One who knew most of her inner life can affirm that she never appeared to falter for a moment from these convictions, which were received with the simple and child-like faith which marked her whole conduct through life. For more than forty years she assisted her husband in conducting a large establishment for education, superintending at the same time the instruction of her own children, and attending also to the concerns of a farm and extensive gardens, in which she took great delight. Nor were her social duties with regard to the neighbourhood neglected. A highly-cultivated and well-informed mind led her to desire the improvement of all within her sphere, and numbers are able and willing to attribute their taste for elevated and refined employments to the influence of one who unobtrusively aimed at promoting the happiness and welfare of those around her. She is gone to reap the reward of her labours, and "her works do follow her." Recently a handsome tablet has been erected by the congregation assembling in the Abbey chapel, Tavistock, to the memory of the Rev. William Evans, and space is left for the inscription of a name ever to be remembered and revered in the circle in which she moved. Her children preserve with great pleasure many essays and lectures written for the improvement of her family by this good wife and mother.

The following pleasing lines, addressed by Mrs. Evans to a friend and neighbour, will indicate some of her mental and social qualities :

*To the Rev. J. Commins, on his Birthday,
Eighty-one, from Anna Evans.*

Eighty-one ! the patriarch's age !
Time respects thee, honoured sage !

Leaves thee yet some joy in life ;
 Children, friends, beloved wife,
 Grey in years, but young in heart,
 Acting still a childlike part ;
 As thy days were first begun,
 They are now, at eighty-one.
 I, who am a step behind,
 On a couch of pain reclined,
 Greet thee, as in days of yore,
 With the friendship of fourscore.
 We have borne the toil and strife
 On the battle-field of life.
 Oft, when poverty assailed,
 Bravely have our arms prevailed.
 Oft, when sorrow cast a shade,
 We have watched and wept and prayed,
 Till the beams of heavenly light
 Made our pathway firm and bright.
 Not with selfish aim we fought ;
 Not from sordid motives wrought :
 For the young ones at our side,
 Then our hope, our joy, our pride,—
 For the faith, in days of old
 Which our forefathers upheld,
 We have laboured. Duly there,
 In our hallowed house of prayer,
 Week by week our steps have trod
 To the worship of our God.
 There we heard the well-known voice,
 Bidding all around "Rejoice!"
 Could he now at Christmas-tide
 With thee once again abide,
 He would soothe thy look of care
 By his kind fraternal air ;
 While his words of heavenly cheer
 Gently whisper in thy ear,
 "Faithful still, at eighty-one,
 Servant of thy God, well done!"

Jan. 30, at Hackney Terrace, Hackney, JAMES BOWMAN, Esq., aged 81. He was born at Cockermouth, where he received his education and spent the first twenty years of his life. He then came to London, where for half a century he devoted himself to mercantile pursuits. At about the age of threescore years and ten he gave up business, and was permitted to enjoy the privileges and advantages of a quiet evening of life before the great change. And now that this change has come, a brief tribute to his memory from the pen of a friend may not be unsuitable. From all who knew him he had the respect due to a man of sterling qualities; but owing to a naturally retiring disposition, his full worth could be felt only by the few who were intimately acquainted with him. To them he was warmly and lastingly attached, and they highly valued his friendship. To the pleasure which always attends the society of a genial and kindly spirit, he added the interest of a mind more than

usually observant and intelligent. He was not brought up in our own religious community, but when in middle life he learnt what Unitarianism really is, he recognized in it, as many others have done, the faith which had been virtually his from his early years. Among the wise maxims of which he had a rich store, a favourite one was, that the happiness of life is very much made up of what are called little things; and in his own experience they afforded ample opportunity for performing the duties and realizing the blessings of faith, hope and charity.

Give true hearts but earth and sky,
 And some flowers to bloom and die ;
 Homely scenes and simple views
 Lowly thoughts may best infuse.

How profitably he spent the quiet of his last years was especially apparent when he received his summons to depart; he was calm and prepared, not weary of this world, and yet ready to leave it. He loved and enjoyed life to the last, but in such a way as to be willing to change it for the life that shall never end. His remains were interred in the Abney Park Cemetery.

T. S.

Feb. 2, at Swansea, aged 18 months, HENRY DUNSFORD, son of C. H. PERKINS, Esq.

Feb. 6, at his residence, Stoborough, near Wareham, Mr. MOSES CHURCHILL, in his 86th year.

Feb. 9, MARY ANNE, wife of Royston OLIVER, Esq., of Roach Mills, Rochdale, in the 54th year of her age. An excellent and admirable Christian woman of great intelligence and exemplary kindness; she dies deeply regretted by a large circle of friends.

Feb. 15, at his residence, Beeston, aged 41 years, Rev. EDWARD HALL, for ten years Minister to the Poor in connection with the Holbeck Domestic Mission, Leeds. [May we request from one of our correspondents in the West Riding some account of this estimable and lamented missionary. ED. C. R.]

Feb. 16, at his residence, Rake Lane, Liverpool, in his 71st year, GEORGE HOLT, Esq. We hope in our next No. to give some biographical particulars of this excellent man.

At Broxbourne House, Herts, T. HOSKINS, Esq., Commander R.N., aged 84.